Black

SOME

REMARKS

UPON

The Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory

OF THE

Ancient Churches

OF

PIEDMONT.

By P. *ALLIX*, D. D.

Imprimatur.

Sept. 23. 1689.

Z. Iſham, R. P. D. Henrico Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris.

LONDON,

Printed for *Richard Chiſwell*, at the Roſe and Crown in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*, MDCXC.

COLL. REG. OXON.
BIBL.

TO THE KING.

May it please Your Majesty,

IF *Your Majesty, following the Example of Your Glorious Ancestors, did not think it an Honour to maintain the Reformed Religion, I should never have undertaken to present your Majesty with a Treatise of this nature. This Defence of the Ancient Churches of the Valleys of* Piedmont, *is a kind of Apology for the Reformation brought about in the Century last past, in which those*

Hero's *of your Name, had ſo great a part. The Reformation, rightly conſidered, conſiſts only in the rejecting of what for many Ages has been ſuperadded to the Chriſtian Religion. The Conduct of the ancient Churches of the Valleys of* Piedmont *has ſerved for a Model to our Reformers, and has juſtified their Undertaking; ſeeing they have always preſerved amongſt them the Sacred Truths of the Chriſtian Religion committed to them, as they had received them from the Diſciples of the Apoſtles; and rejected the Corruptions thereof, according as by degrees they broke forth in the* Weſt. *This hath been the only thing that hath made them the Object of the Hatred of the Church of* Rome, *and hath drawn upon them, for ſo many Ages, ſuch prodigious Floods of Perſecution. 'Tis very true that the Wretched Remains of theſe Ancient Churches, appear too contemptible to attract the Eyes of the Princes of the Earth towards them; their preſent Deſolation ſeeming ſo univerſal, that the World looks upon them no otherwiſe than irrecoverably loſt, and finally deſtroyed. But all* Europe *knows, That your Majeſty does not judge of things according to the Corrupt Maxims of the World; but the True Light of the Goſpel, which informs*

us,

us, That outward Prosperity is not entailed on the True Church; That Jesus Christ owns those only for his Disciples, who take up their Cross, and follow him; That he knows how to frustrate the hopes of their Persecutors, by miraculously supporting and continuing his Church, whilest they suppose themselves to have finally triumphed over it. This is that Your Majesty gave a high proof of, when, from Your Royal Throne, You were pleased to cast an Eye on the miserable Estate of that little Flock of dispersed Christians, in affording them an happy retreat in Your Dominions, as to the Ancient Professors of Pure Christianity, and the faithful Witnesses of those saving Truths, which all Protestants do profess. What Marks of Your Charity and Compassion have they not received? And of what Efficacy hath not this great Example of Your Majesty been, to oblige Your Subjects to give them fresh Instances of their Brotherly Love and Affection towards them? Thus, Great Sir, whilest You make good the Character of a Prince, who draws the Eyes of all the World upon Him, by the greatness of His Exploits, by the steadiness of His Conduct, and by the Moderation of His Government; You, at the same time, bear the impress of a Prince truly Christian, full

of

of Zeal for the Interests of His Saviour, and of Compassion for those who suffer for the sake of his Gospel. This being a Truth so generally owned, I have taken the boldness to lay at Your Majesty's Feet, and publish under Your August Name, the Defence of these illustrious Confessors of the Truth, whom their Enemies have endeavoured to bear down with their Calumnies, after having born them down with the violence of their horrid and bloody Persecutions. God hath so miraculously raised Your Majesty for the rescuing of the Protestant Religion, from the Destruction ready prepared for it, and which had been infallible, without the Vigilance and Heroical Courage of Your Majesty; that those who suffer for it, suppose they may have leave thus to address Your Majesty, whilest they comfort themselves in their sufferings, with the prospect of that powerful safeguard and support God hath provided for his poor distressed and afflicted Church, in the Person of Your Majesty, as an evident Mark of his Favour and Protection. May the great God, who has so tenderly preserved Your Majesty against all the Attempts and Machinations of Your Enemies, and hitherto has made You triumph with so much Glory over them, continue to pour forth on Your Majesty

the

the choiceſt of his Bleſſings and Favours, Crown with a glorious Succeſs the great Undertakings of Your Majeſty for the good of Your Subjects, for the Advantage of Europe, *and for the comfort of all thoſe who profeſs the Truth: are the ardent Prayers conſtantly preſented to God by him who is, with a moſt profound reſpect,*

Your Majeſty's

Moſt humble and obedient

Subject and Servant,

P. ALLIX.

The Epistle Dedicatory.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the First Rise and Original of the Churches of *Italy*. Pag. 1.

CHAP. II.

The State of the Christian Religion in the Diocess of *Italy*, until the end of the Fourth Century. p. 6.

CHAP. III.

Opinions of Authors of the Diocess of *Italy*, in the Fourth Century, concerning Matters of Faith and Worship. p. 14

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Faith of the Churches of the Diocess of *Italy* during the Fifth Century. p. 23

CHAP. V.

Opinions of the Churches of *Italy* during the Sixth Century. p. 27

CHAP. VI.

Opinions of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, during the Seventh Century. p. 33

CHAP. VII.

Some Reflections upon the Liturgy of this Dioceſs, called the *Ambroſian Liturgy*. p. 36

CHAP. VIII.

Opinions of the Churches of *Italy*, during the Eighth Century. p. 45

CHAP. IX.

Opinions of the Church of *Italy*, during the Ninth Century. p. 57

CHAP. X.

The Faith of the Churches of *Italy* in the Tenth Century. p. 80

CHAP. XI.

An Enquiry into the Opinions of *Gundulphus* and his Followers, before the year 1026. p. 93

CHAP. XII.

Reflections upon ſome Practices of the Churches of the Dioceſs of *Italy*. p. 101

CHAP. XIII.

That the Dioceſs of *Italy* was an Independent Dioceſs, till after the midſt of the Eleventh Century. p. 109

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Concerning the Separation of the Churches of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, from the Church of *Rome*; and of the Faith of the *Paterines*. p. 118

CHAP. XV.

Concerning the Belief of the *Manichees*, of their riſe in *Italy*, their growth, and their eſtabliſhment. p. 129

CHAP. XVI.

Concerning the *Cathari* ſpoken of by *Evervinus* and St. *Bernard*, and their Diſtinction from the *Paterines*. p. 139

CHAP. XVII.

A Continuation of the Hiſtory of the *Cathari* in *Italy*, as elſewhere, and their Diſtinction from the *Paterines*. p. 149

CHAP. XVIII.

That the *Paterines* and *Subalpini* were not *Manichees*, as is evident from their Writings, and from their Opinions in the Twelfth Century. p. 159

CHAP. XIX.

That the Churches of *Italy* were not founded by *Peter Waldo*. p. 175

CHAP. XX.

Whether the *Waldenſes* were at firſt only Schiſmaticks. p. 183

CHAP. XXI.

Concerning the State of the Church of *Rome*, at the time of the Separation of the *Paterines* or *Waldenſes*; together with the Accuſations charg'd upon them

them by the ſaid Church, and the Idea they had conceived of her. p. 198

CHAP. XXII.

Concerning the Belief and Conduct of the *Waldenſes* in *Bohemia*. p. 211

CHAP. XXIII.

Some inſtances of the Arguments which the *Waldenſes* of *Bohemia* waged in their Diſputes with the Church of *Rome*. p. 221

CHAP. XXIV.

Concerning the Government of the Churches of the *Waldenſes*, and of the ſucceſſion of their Miniſters. p. 238

CHAP. XXV.

Concerning the Perſecutions which the *Waldenſes* have ſuffered ſince the XI. Century. p. 256

CHAP. XXVI.

An Inſtance of the Calumnies of ſome Inquiſitors. p. 269

CHAP. XXVII.

That the Church of the Valleys of *Piedmont* have conſtantly perſeverd in the ſame Faith, until the Time of the Reformation. p. 280

CHAP. XXVIII.

Containing the Concluſion of this Treatiſe. p. 292

TO

THE PREFACE.

THE *Biſhop of* Meaux *has lately publiſhed a Treatiſe, entituled* [The Hiſtory of the Variations of Proteſtants.] *He had formed the draught of it ſome Years ago, to engage the* French *Court to recal the Edict of* Nantes, *without any Scruple or Heſitation. The pretence ſeemed very plauſible, the Clergy, who were both Party and Judge againſt the Proteſtants, were to declare, That for aſmuch as the* French *Proteſtants had changed their Belief; the Court was no longer obliged to the Obſervation of an Edict, which* Henry IV. *had granted to their Anceſtors, who were of other Principles. But this Edict being recalled before the Biſhop's work was finiſhed, and the* French *Court, which is not guilty of being over ſcrupulous, not thinking it ſelf to ſtand in need of ſo vain a pretence, the Biſhop was fain to employ his Work to another uſe. His Deſign therefore in the preſent publiſhing thereof, is, to deceive thoſe, who by ways of Violence have been made to enter into the boſome of the Romiſh Church, and whom the ſame violence keeps there, againſt the ſenſe of their Conſcience.*

This Prelate had before endeavoured in his Expoſition of the Roman Faith, where he employs his utmoſt Artifice to ſweeten, diſguiſe and diſſemble the matters and difficulties in Controverſie, to abuſe the Proteſtants, in order to make them more eaſily digeſt the Roman Religion, than they are apt to do, when they view it in its

natural colours. And now in this his History of their Variations, he endeavours to represent to them the Belief of the Reformers, and most illustrious Protestant Doctors, in the strangest colo rs imaginable; that those whom the Dragoons have converted to the Roman Faith, might look upon the force that has been made use of to drive them from so detestable a Communion, as a saving and charitable violence. It is always the same Spirit of falsification and juggling that animates and guides him.

In this his last Design, it had been natural for him, had his Intention been right, to have endeavoured to make out, That the Protestants, or their Teachers, were divided in their Belief of the Articles of the Creed, about the object of Prayer, and the necessity thereof, about the necessity of Obedience to the Commands of God, as well as the extent of that obedience; and about the Doctrine and number of the Sacraments: for in these Points it is, that the Protestants make the Essence of their Religion to consist Now it is well known, that in all these they do agee; the Questions that are ventilated among them, being like those Questions that remain d among the Primitive Christians, upon several points of Divinity; and some of them being no other than meer Controversies about which the Protestants have learnt to divide themselves in imitation of the Schools of the Romish Divines. But had the Bishop followed this method, he would have failed of his end; wherefore he thought it sufficient for his purpose, slightly to touch the matters in Controversie, and to put into good French, whatsoever he could rake together, from the writings of those of his Communion, to expose the first Reformers, and to make the Reformation odious.

It would be an affront put upon the Age we live in, to imagin that this thick laying on of Paint, should be capable to impose upon any, that have never so little Judgment left. The Bishop may please to flatter himself with

the

the ſucceſs of his firſt Work, the Expoſition of the Romiſh Faith: but I believe him too ſincere not to own, That he has made no impreſſion upon the Spirit of any Proteſtants, ſave ſuch only who were ready to embrace the firſt pretenses that were offered, to rid themſelves of a Religion, that expos'd them to ſo many Miſeries; or the profeſſion whereof hindred their ſettlement in the World. Thoſe who have been forc'd to become Papiſts againſt their Conſciences, have found by experience, That it was not ſufficient for them to ſubſcribe the Expoſition of the Biſhop of Meaux: *No! their Perſecuters were not at all minded to make them of his Religion; but they were fain to ſwallow whole and entire the Profeſſion of Faith drawn up by* Pius IV.

And we may aſſure the Biſhop, That the ſame will be the Lot of this preſent Work which he has entitled, The Hiſtory of the Variations of the Proteſtants in Matters of Faith *For let us ſuppoſe that this Prelate has very well proved what he pretends to make out, what will follow from hence? But only this, That the Reformers were not infallible, that they did not at firſt reject all that deſerved to be cenſur'd as Popery; that ſome difficulties have been met with in the Hypotheſis of thoſe, who were not happy enough, to refine and clear ſuch corrupt matters; in a word, That they did not at firſt diſcover all that was to be known and believed as to ſeveral Points of Divinity, and that they were fain to take a great deal of pains in the diſcovery of that Truth, which the Roman Church had taken ſo much pains to obſcure and confound. We'll ſuppoſe a Proteſtant Caſuiſt at this time to write about Matters of Conſcience, and, for want of examining with ſufficient care the Deciſions of Licentious Caſuiſts, to follow ſome of them, being ſeduc'd by the falſe Principles of theſe Roman Caſuiſts, which the Biſhop of* Meaux *condemns; will it follow, That an*

hundred and fifty years after this, ſome other Biſhop of Meaux *will have right to propoſe under the title of Proteſtant Variations, the miſtaken Opinion of this Caſuiſt, though afterwards his Party, perceiving the Deluſion, have declared againſt his Opinion?*

The Biſhop is very pleaſant in forbidding the Proteſtants to make uſe of the way of Recrimination againſt the Church of Rome, *in this Point of Variation, though indeed one only inſtance of Variation in Faith, of fifty whereof we can convince them, be a ſufficient Conviction of a Church, which pretends her ſelf to be immoveable, becauſe infallible. But being very ſenſible of the weakneſs of his cauſe in this Point, he found he ſhould be obliged, either to acknowledge that his Church is a falſe Church, and much more deſerving that cenſure, than the Proteſtant, as having been ſubject to a far greater number of Variations in her Belief; or elſe that he would be obliged to make uſe of the ſame anſwer we do, in renouncing the infallibility of his Church. But it is no matter of wonder, if by degrees only we come to the perfect knowledge of the Truth.*

Moreover, is it not a very pleaſant Method, to reduce the Diſpute to the Examination of ſome Præliminaries, whereas the ground it ſelf has been diſputed above theſe 150. *Years.*

In a word, whatſoever the Reformers may have been, yet 'tis but juſt that the Church of Rome, *being accuſed of Hereſie, Idolatry and Tyranny, ſhould clear her ſelf of theſe Accuſations. Whatſoever may have been the Carriage of* Conſtantinus Copronymus, *How can the Manners of that Emperor be concerned in the Queſtion,* Whether the worſhipping of Images be contrary to the Law of God? *The Reformation of* Jehu *King of* Iſrael, *did it ceaſe to be a Reformation from* Ahab's *Idolatry, though he himſelf were a*

wicked

wicked person, and an Hypocrite, and tho' he did the thing but imperfectly?

In truth, the care the Bishop of Meaux *has taken in his Preface and whole Book, to represent to us the Immutability of his Church, and her Constancy in matters of Faith and Worship, has opened so fair a field to his Antagonists, whom he attacks about the History of the Reformation in the several parts of* Europe, *and particularly in* France, *that he could not reasonably expect but to be oppos'd by them on all sides, with all the vigor imaginable. There are still some* Lutherans, *who have already made it appear, they are not at all afraid of the Reproaches of a Party, whose Head that condemned them,* Leo X, *was an avowed Atheist, and who lookt upon the Gospel to be no better than a Fable. There are* French Protestants *left still, whom Providence has delivered from the bloody hands of the Bishops of* France, *to maintain the Interest of the Reformation; neither does* England *want able Divines sufficient to repel all the Bishop of* Meaux's *Slanders. After all, I hope the Bishop will give us leave to examin a little the Constancy of his Church, as to her Faith and Worship.*

In expectation therefore that the several Authors, whom the Bishop of Meaux *has been pleased to assault, will give him full satisfaction; which as it is no hard matter for them to do, so I question not but they will do it very suddenly: I thought I might take to task one of his Books,* viz. *the* XI. *wherein he treats concerning the* Albigenses, *and the* Waldenses: *and forasmuch as therein he has carried Calumny to the highest degree imaginable, I thought it was my duty, in examining this part of his Book, to give a scantling of his fair Dealing, and the Sincerity he employs in delivering the History of those two ancient Churches, to whom the Reformed Party are so much obliged.*

I know

I know well enough that the ſtrength of our defence does not depend on the juſtifying of thoſe Churches. Let the Albigenſes *have been* Manichees, *as the Biſhop pretends to prove them; let the* Waldenſes *have been only a company of Schiſmaticks, as the Biſhop is pleaſed to call them: the Grounds of the Reformation will remain juſt and firm for all that, if the Foundation of our Reaſons holds good, and if the Church of* Rome *be guilty of the Errors, Idolatry, and Tyranny whereof we accuſe her. But I conceived, 1. That it was well becoming a Chriſtian to undertake the defence of Innocence, oppreſſed and overborn by the blackeſt Calumnies the Devil could ever invent. 2. That we ſhould be ungrateful towards thoſe whoſe Sufferings for Chriſt have been ſo beneficial to his Church, ſhould we not take care to juſtifie their Memory, when we ſee it ſo maliciouſly beſpattered and torn. 3. That to juſtifie the* Waldenſes *and* Albigenſes, *is indeed to defend the Reformation and Reformers, they having ſo long before us, with an exemplary Courage endeavoured to preſerve the ancient Chriſtian Religion, which the Church of* Rome *all this while has endeavoured to aboliſh, by ſubſtituting a Baſtard and ſuppoſititious Chriſtianity inſtead thereof. Whilſt the Miniſters of the Church of* Rome *think fit to follow his Conduct, who was a Liar and Murtherer from the beginning; Innocence ought at leaſt to have leave to defend her ſelf againſt their Calumnies, whilſt ſhe willingly reſigns to God the vengeance of the Injuſtice and Violence of thoſe who have oppreſt her.*

'Tis not my deſign here to write the whole Hiſtory of the Waldenſes *and* Albigenſes; *that has been done already in ſeveral parts, by four or five famous Authors, whoſe Books are in all hands; I mean* Chaſſagnon, Perrin, *the moſt learned Archbiſhop of* Armagh, Giles Leger, *and* Morland. *If any thing may be added to their Writings, it is concerning the Original of thoſe Churches,*

ches, their condition before the Twelfth Century, and their total ruine about two or three years ago.

'Tis for those that live in the Neighbourhood of Piedmont, *and who have received into their bosom the miserable Remains of those so pure and so ancient Churches, to preserve the memory of so dreadful a Desolation. I hope also that their Piety and Zeal will prompt them to search with all the exactness possible, for what may serve to continue the Sequel of the History of the Churches of the Valleys of* Piedmont, *since the time where* Morland *and* Leger *end their Works. I am perswaded also, that those who have undertaken to write an account of the ruin of the Churches of* France, *will not forget to set down the particulars of that Persecution, which has destroy'd the flourishing Flocks of the Province of* Languedoc, *a Country where the Reformation met with so easie a Reception at first, because of the Remainders of the Doctrin of the* Albigenses, *who had dwelt there for so long a time.*

What I undertake in these my Reflections, is only this; To set down the true Antiquity of both these Churches, who were so famous in the Thirteenth Century, because of the opposition they made against the Corruptions which the Romish *Church had introduced in matters of Faith, Worship, and the Government of the Church. And as they then maintained, That they derived their Original from the Apostles, so I hope to make out, That in so doing they advanced nothing which is not exactly conformable to the History of the Ages past, from the time of the Apostles, to the Thirteenth Century. This is that I shall endeavour, by making out the Succession of these Churches, as well with respect to their Doctrin and Worship, as with respect to their Ministry.*

As this Design will engage me in the discussion of a great number of Authors, who have lived from the time of the Apostles to the said Thirteenth Century; so it

it will be difficult to give so Smooth a form to these Observations, as might be expected in a continued History. In this case it is unavoidable, but the Discourse will prove here and there dry and rugged, what pains soever may be taken to the contrary. But to make amends for this, we may promise that the Judicious Reader, who is only in quest of truth, will find abundantly wherewith to satisfie himself, by examining the Matters of Fact set down in these Observations.

I shall treat of the History of each of these Churches in particular, and observe much the same Method in the one as the other; and am not without hope, that the Remarks I shall make, will serve to confound the injustice of those, who though they know that what the Protestants believe and practise, is truly Apostolical, cease not to wrangle and prevaricate, upon pretence that we cannot shew them any Church before the Reformation, or at least before the Twelfth Century, which has absolutely defended the same Opinions as we do. This also will be of use to strengthen the Faith of Protestants, who will perceive from thence, that God, according to his Promise, hath never left himself without Witness, as having preserved in the bosom of these two Churches, most Illustrious Professors of the Christian Religion, which they held in the same Purity with which their Predecessors had received this precious Pledge from the hand of those Apostolical Men, who at first planted these Churches among the Alpes and Pyrenæan Mountains, that they might be exposed to the view of four or five Kingdoms all at once. I begin with the Churches of Italy.

SOME

ERRATA

PAge 3. lin. 36. *his* r. *thoſe*, p. 12. l. 13. *cares* r. *care which*, and l. 25. *Theodoſius* r. *Gratianus*, p. 27. l. 22. *peccatores* r. *peccator es*, p. 51. l. 15. *vexandati* r. *vexandati*, and l. 29. *approaching* r. *reproaching*, p. 58. l. 23. *bring* r. *was*, p. 64. l. 20. *montem* r. *montem*, p. 102. l. 4. *found* r. *has founded*, and l. 6. r. *is unknown*, p. 111. l. 17. r. 556. p. 126. l. 23. r. *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, p. 130. l. 11. put out *as*, p. 159. l. 28. *which* r. *whoſe*, p. 234. l. 11. r. *whatſoever has been ſaid*, p. 287. l. 22. r. *who never*, l. 23. *not only*, r. *either*, for *but* r. *or*, p. 290. l. 32. *to be* r. *as*.

SOME REMARKS UPON THE Ecclesiastical History Of the Ancient Church of Piedmont.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the First Rise and Original of the Churches of Italy.

BY *Italy*, I do not understand here the several Countries which, at this day, bear that name, but only the Seven Provinces to which that name was given, by way of distinction, and which constituted a particular Government, being particularly under the care of the Lieutenant of the Western Prætorian Prefect. These Provinces were *Liguria*, *Æmilia*, *Flaminia*, *Venetia*, the *Alpes*, both *Cottian* and *Greek*, and *Rhætia*, or the Country of the *Grisons*. There were three Legions amongst the Troops of the Empire, which peculiarly had the name of *Italick*, because probably at first they had been raised in that Diocess; whereof *Milan* was

the capital City, and the place of Reſidence of the Lieutenant, we have juſt now mentioned.

An. 51. n. 54. *Baronius* takes it for an undoubted truth, That St. *Barnabas*, the famous Companion of St. *Paul* in the Work of the Miniſtry, was the firſt Founder of the Church of *Milan*, and of the Churches of *Liguria*, which he referrs to the year 51 of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; that is, to the 49 year, if we rectifie his Chronology. In defending this his Opinion, he grounds himſelf on very ſure Traditions, as he reckons upon the Records of the Church of *Milan*, and upon the Teſtimonies of many Authors. *Ughellus* is of the ſame mind, and *Ripamontius*, who hath written the Hiſtory of that Church, from the beginning thereof, and ſets down all he could get together for ſupport of this Opinion. But to ſpeak my ſenſe plainly concerning this Opinion of *Baronius*, and thoſe that follow him therein; I believe they have abuſed themſelves by following late Authorities, and ſuch as cannot make out ſo antient a matter. All this ſo ſure Tradition, and theſe Monuments of the Church of *Milan* owe their Riſe to the fooliſh Vanity, which the Emulation of the *Weſtern* Prelates, for precedency and jurisdiction, has given birth to, ſince the VIII. Century: Indeed, ſince that time, there is ſcarcely a conſiderable Church in *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, or *England*, that did not challenge ſome Apoſtle, or Diſciple of the Apoſtles, for their Founder.

Liturg. Pamel. pag. 386. I acknowledge, That the Liturgy, which bears the name of St. *Ambroſe*, ſuppoſes St. *Barnabas* to have been the firſt Biſhop of *Milan*; but that alone is ſufficient to make it appear, That that Liturgy, as well as others of the ſame nature, hath ſuffered great alterations, ſince its firſt reception in that Dioceſs. The later Ages have made a great part of their Piety to conſiſt in inventing theſe Fables, and the ignorance and blind zeal of People hath prompted them to entertain impertinent Legends as Articles of Faith, whereof the leaſt footſtep is not to be found in the firſt Monuments of Antiquity. The Learnedſt men of the Church of *Rome* have, in a manner, wholly baniſhed

theſe

theſe Apoſtolical Originals into the Land of Fables, from whence they all proceeded at firſt; though ſome ſooner, others later, yet all of them ſince the VIII. Century; as we have hinted. *Baronius* therefore ought to have called to mind here that Judicious Maxim, with reference to Hiſtory; which he himſelf alledgeth elſewhere, *Quod ſine antiquo Authore dicitur, contemnitur*; Whatſoever is aſſerted without the teſtimony of ſome ancient Author, ought to be deſpiſed.

Though it is plain, I might draw ſome advantage in the ſequel of my diſcourſe, from the confeſſion of *Baronius* and other Authors that have writ the Originals of the Churches of *Liguria*; yet I ſhall take heed of making uſe of it, my aim being not to gain any thing by the ignorance or fabulouſneſs of our Adverſary, but exactly to ſearch out Truth. Accordingly I find, 1. That the ancient Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory doth not give us the leaſt hint, that ever St. *Barnabas* preached in *Italy*, properly ſo called. Several Authors, as *Origen* and St. *Chryſoſtome*, give not him the ſame allotment that the later Hiſtorians of *Milan* have done. Euſeb. hiſt. l. 3. c. 1.

2. I find it was a thing wholly unknown in the time of St. *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, as alſo to Pope *Innocent* the Firſt, in the beginning of the Fifth Century. 3*dly*, I do not find that any of the Authors who lived in that Dioceſs, as St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Maximus*, and others, have ever ſet forth the Glory of this Apoſtolical Foundation of the Church of *Milan* by St. *Barnabas*. 4*ly*, *Petrus Damianus* might alone have ſerved to correct this erroneous Opinion of *Baronius*: for being ſent to perſwade the Church of *Milan* to ſubmit to that of *Rome*, he doth not at all take notice of the Clergy of *Milan*, pretending to deſcend from St. *Barnabas*; but maintains to their Face, that they had received the Goſpel from the Biſhops of the Church of *Rome*. There is no man of any Judgment, who is never ſo little verſed in the Hiſtory of the Church, on whom his Remarks will not make a greater impreſſion, than all thoſe Fables on which *Baronius*, and De Præſcript. p. 237, & 238 Epiſt. 1. ad Decent. Opuſc. 5. p. 32.

others like him, have built, in order to eſtabliſh their pretended Tradition.

I am not ignorant, that ſince the Thirteenth Century, *Raynerius* reports, That the Churches of the *Waldenſes* maintain'd, that they were Apoſtolical Churches: but the word *Apoſtolical* muſt then be taken in the ſenſe *Tertullian* gives it in his Book of Preſcriptions, which I have juſt now alledged, *Naſcentes ex matricibus Apoſtolicis deputantur ut ſoboles Apoſtolicarum Eccleſiarum.* Indeed, they are never the leſs Apoſtolical, becauſe they did not receive the Doctrine of the Goſpel immediately from the Apoſtles themſelves. It is ſufficient to make them deſerve the name of *Apoſtolical*, that they received the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, as a pledge from the hand of their firſt Diſciples, which they preſerved ſo very tenderly throughout the following Ages.

It is hard to determine whether it was in the firſt Century that theſe Apoſtolical men planted the Chriſtian Religion at *Milan*, and the Dioceſs thereunto belonging; or whether it were done in the ſecond Century; foraſmuch as *Milan* was a conſiderable City in thoſe Primitive times, and we find that the Churches of *Lions* and *Vienna* were already famous in the ſecond Age, by reaſon of their Martyrs, Apoſtolick men having firſt of all preached in the capital Cities, that the Goſpel from thence, as the head Spring, might diffuſe it ſelf throughout the whole Dioceſs, and ſo facilitate the propagation thereof. I am very much inclined to believe, either that the ſame Preachers who came from *Greece*, out of the boſom of the Apoſtolick Church, to plant the Faith amongſt the *Gauls*, did alſo cultivate the Dioceſs of *Milan*, that belonged to *Gallia Ciſalpina*: or, That the Diſciples of the Apoſtles St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, who for their Maſter Jeſus Chriſt had conquered the Cities neighbouring to *Rome*, purſu'd their Victories as far as *Milan* and its Dioceſs.

I don't think any man can preciſely define the time of their preaching, thoſe firſt Diſciples having been much more careful

careful to preach the Goſpel, than to write the Hiſtory of it. For, we cannot relie much upon what they tell us concerning the firſt Succeſſors of St. *Barnabas* at *Milan*, no more than we can upon that which they aſſert, That St. *Barnabas* was the Founder of that Church. Laſtly, I do not think it neceſſary to ſhew, (as ſome reformed Divines do) That the *Bagaudæ*, of whom mention is made in the time of *Diocleſian*, were the Predeceſſors of the *Waldenſes*, and that they were both Chriſtians and Martyrs. It is true, that they build this their Opinion upon the Martyrdom of St. *Maurice*, and of the *Thebæan* Legion, which ſeems to be confirmed by the life of St. *Babolenus*, publiſhed by *Chiffletius* at the end of *Bede*. But this Foundation is of no ſtrength. The Martyrdome of the *Thebæan* Legion, is no more than a ridiculous Fable, unknown to all the ancient Hiſtorians of the Church; publiſhed by ſome Impoſtor, under the name of St. *Eucherius*: and the Life of St. *Babolenus*, is a ridiculous Legend, being no waies fit to confirm ſo great an action of that antiquity. We need only read what is ſet down by thoſe ancient Authors, who make mention of theſe *Bagaudæ*, and it will be found, that we cannot with reaſon make Chriſtians of them.

But, however it may be, and though we ſhould acknowledge, that the Church of *Milan* was founded by the care of the Succeſſors of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* at *Rome*, yet it is of importance to obſerve, that this can give no Right to the Biſhop of *Rome*, over him of *Milan*, no more than St. *Polycarp* acquired any Right over the ſeveral Dioceſſes, amongſt the *Gaules*, whoſe Churches were founded by thoſe whom he had ſent abroad to preach the Goſpel. Pope *Innocent* the Firſt complains, in his Epiſtle to *Decentius*, That the Biſhops of his own Province did not follow the Cuſtoms of the Church of *Rome*. If this happened in his own Province, which without doubt had been converted by the endeavours of his Predeceſſors; we may very well judge, that the firſt Preachers of *Milan* and its Dioceſs, had not ſubjected *Milan* to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

This

This is acknowledged by Pope *Pius* the Second, who owns in his Apology for the Romiſh Church, written in the Year 1457. that before the Council of *Nice*, ſmall regard was had to the Biſhop of *Rome*. It is very neceſſary that this truth ſhould be ſolidly proved, which accordingly I deſign to do in the Sequel of this Work; and to ſhew the independence of that Dioceſs on the Biſhops of *Rome*; My buſineſs at preſent is to lay down the Belief and Worſhip of thoſe Churches, which were planted by the Diſciples of the Apoſtles, and will be the Subject of the following Chapters.

CHAP. II.

The State of the Chriſtian Religion in the Dioceſs of Italy, *until the end of the Fourth Century.*

FOraſmuch as we have ſcarce any Author of this Dioceſs, during the Three hundred and fifty firſt Years after the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe Writings are ſtill in being; it will be impoſſible for us to give an account of the State of the Chriſtian Religion in that Dioceſs, any other way than by conſidering the ſtate of the Neighbouring Dioceſſes, and moſt other Churches during that interval. But with this aſſiſtance we may be able to ſupply the want of thoſe Authors, whoſe memory Time hath buried in Oblivion, or whoſe Writings have been deſtroyed by Perſecutions or by Barbariſms.

We cannot doubt but that the Principal Articles of their Faith, were contained in the Apoſtles Creed, which though it were not written by the Apoſtles, yet was received with a general approbation, as appears from what *Tertullian* and St. *Ire-*

St. *Irenæus* tell us. Neither did they, without doubt, own any other Tradition, beſides that of St. *Irenæus*, that nothing ought to be laid down for certain truth, but what Jeſus Chriſt hath taught, or the Apoſtles written, and left to the Apoſtolical Churches as a Sacred *Depoſitum*.

'Tis undoubtedly ſure, that this was the Inſtruction, which was given to the *Catechumeni*, who after private inſtructions were earneſtly exhorted to read the Writings of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, to confirm and advance themſelves in the knowledge of the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion. And it is as ſure that the Strangers, who came with this Profeſſion, were received as Brethren, and they looked upon as Hereticks who advanced any Doctrine contrary to the Abridgment of the Chriſtian Faith.

The Biſhops when they preached, took the Holy Scripture for the Subject of their Sermon; they explained the Myſteries thereof. The Prieſts and Deacons did as much afterwards, by order of the Biſhops, in the ſeveral places where they were ſetled; the one as well as the other, being called to their Offices by the conſent of the People, without which their Miniſtry was not acknowledged, or owned.

They admitted the *Catechumeni*, after an exact inſtruction, and baptized them on *Eaſter-day* and *Whitſunday*, and prepared them for the receiving of that Sacrament, by long continued Faſts, which were preſcribed them, and which the Church obſerved with them, to witneſs to them the concern they took in their Converſion.

The *Catechumeni* did not aſſiſt at the Celebration of the Euchariſt, but were admitted to it, after that they had received Baptiſm, and before that, were to make confeſſion of their ſins, in token of their Contrition.

It was not till ſome time after the Apoſtles, yea even till after the Second Century, that anointings were added to the Ceremony of Baptiſm, as well before as after the receiving of it; which was the charge of the Biſhops, who gave the Chriſm to the new Baptized, together with

the

the Impoſition of hands. The new-baptized were clothed in white, eight days after their Baptiſm: before which they gave them Salt to taſte, and Milk and Hony to drink. Thus by little and little did they ſtuff out this Holy Ceremony, as if it were come too plain and homely out of the hands of our Saviour and his Apoſtles.

They received the Lord's Supper, immediately after Baptiſm, and the People offered Bread and Wine on the Table whereof they communicated. All that were preſent, were obliged to communicate. The Deacons proclaimed the *Surſum Corda*, which was a ſufficient hint that they were to ſeek Chriſt with their hearts in Heaven, and that they lookt upon that Ceremony as a Commemoration. Both Men and Women received the Sacrament in their hands, without any adoration exhibited to it, and they communicated all under both kinds.

We don't find that they prayed to any, but God through Jeſus Chriſt; They prayed to him for the Penitents, for Believers, for all the neceſſities of the Church and the World, for the Converſion of the Heathens, Jews and Hereticks, for the Emperours and for the Government. They bleſſed God for the Triumphant Death of the Martyrs; and in proceſs of time they prayed for the Dead, that God would be pleaſed to make them Partakers of the firſt Reſurrection, which was not till after the Doctrine of the Temporal Reign of One thouſand Years was introduced.

They carried the Euchariſt to the Sick, and thoſe that were abſent, and they called it the *Viaticum*; a name which would better have ſuited with Extreme Unction, had that been the laſt Sacrament of the Church.

The Biſhops were every one of them Heads of their Churches, but they acted nothing without the conſent of the Clergy of their Church, and the People. The Prieſts adminiſtred the leſſer Churches, but ſo as that their behaviour, as well as their ordination, depended on the Biſhop and his Clergy, who exerciſed Diſcipline upon the Delinquents. They were the Biſhops Counſel, they

they preached, they baptized, they celebrated the Eucharist, they governed the Parishes, as well those that were in the City, as in the Country; They had Deacons, who expounded also the Gospel, who distributed the Eucharist, who carried it to those that were absent, who baptized, and who sometimes, in less considerable places, had the oversight of Churches. They were ordinarily those that visited the Sick and Prisoners, and that took care of the temporal concerns of the Church.

In process of time the number of Church-Officers was multiplied, there were Sub-deacons, Acolythi, Readers, Exorcists, Choristers, Porters and Men that buried the Dead; all these were reduced under the title of Church-Officers: whereas before, the Bishops and Priests performed the duty of Exorcists, which consisted only in praying over the heads of those that were believed to be possessed of the Devil, or which were overtaken with maladies that were looked upon as Possessions. The Diaconesses who were of Apostolical Institution, and received the imposition of hands, and who together with the Virgins and Widows, made, as it were, a part of the Clergy, were employed to instruct the Women in their Houses, to visit the Prisoners, and to prepare and dispose those of their own Sex for the reception of Baptism.

They made a very exact Scrutiny into the manners and knowledge of those, that were admitted into the number of the Clergy; but it was not required of them in some places, to forbear the company of their Wives, in order to their admission, until the beginning of the Fourth Century; neither was it approved of by the Council of *Nice*, in the Year Three hundred twenty five, which left them at Liberty in that respect. In process of time they rarely admitted any to Orders that were married, except they made a Vow to abstain from their Wives. Pope *Siricius* was one of the first that endeavoured to introduce the usage of Ecclesiastical Celibacy, and to make it pass into a Law for his Dioceses.

The Church had at the first, divided sins into two sorts: there were sins, which whosoever was found guilty of, were excommunicated for ever; these were Idolatry, Murther and Adultery; the others did not exclude the Persons guilty for ever, from being reconciled to the Church, but only laid a necessity upon them of doing publick Penance, at the Church-Gate; which at first was done with less severity, during the two first Centuries; but afterwards was made subject to more strict and severe Rules, and continued for some years together, the Church requiring these precautions, the better to be assured of the Sincerity of their Conversion. The intercession of Martyrs and Confessors, or the apparent danger of Death wherein the Penitents were fallen, obliged the Church to remit somewhat of the severity of these Rules, which was called Indulgence.

The respect they had for Confessors and for Martyrs, gave them a great Authority, though many times they were only Women or Laicks: oftentimes by their Sollicitations Peace was granted to Penitents, especially if they were any way related to them. The Memory of their Death was celebrated with thanksgivings to God for their Triumph, which commemoration was renewed every Year. Their Bodies were buried very carefully; and the Church-yards being often the most secure places for the assemblies of Christians, they celebrated the Eucharist in the same places, and upon their Tombs. They boasted of their Communion; and, from an Heathenish conceit, which crept in during the Fourth Century, they considered them as present, and joining their Prayers with the Church, for the Salvation of those, who resorted to their Graves. The Veneration they had for their Reliques, was carried so far, after the midst of the Fourth Century, that in divers places they lighted Lamps, and Wax-Candles on their Tombs, and brought thither Bread and Wine, to eat and drink at their Graves, and celebrate a kind of Feast in honour of them.

Conf. ff. Lib. 6. c. 2. St. *Austin* in his Confessions observes that his Mother, willing to observe this *African* Custom at *Milan*, was reproved therefore by St. *Ambrose*, as being a Heathenish Custom,

Custom, and that she acquiesced in the Bishops determination.

In the Fourth Century, Images began to be introduced into some Churches, *viz.* The Pictures of Martyrs: but they knew nothing yet of painting the Deity, or of giving the Images any Religious worship.

They made the Sign of the Cross on all occasions, as if it had been an Abridgment of the Profession of Christianity, amongst the Heathens, or a powerful Weapon against the Devils.

They did not bury any at first, but in the Church-yards, afterwards they began to bury in places adjoyning to the Church, and at last in the Churches themselves. And it was in those Church yards, ever since the Third Century, that they celebrated the Sacrament of the Eucharist, to render thanks to God for the deliverance of those, whose decease had been commendable and praise worthy.

In the Fourth Century they consecrated Churches but to God alone, and distinguished them from those places, where the Bodies of Martyrs were buried.

They read only in the Churches the Canonical Scriptures, with the respect due unto the Word of God; to which they afterwards joyned some Hymns composed by some Men of great renown, and the sufferings of Martyrs, whose examples were of use to confirm the Faith of the Church.

The People sang in their Assemblies the Psalms of *David*, and this was the most ordinary exercise of Believers when they met together, before day, and at other hours set apart for publick Acts of Piety.

They almost continually concluded the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, with Feasts of Charity, to comfort the Poor, and to entertain Brotherly Unity amongst Believers. At the breaking up of these Feasts, they gave Alms, which were employed for the maintenance of the Poor, and the Clergy, who had no other incomes, until that *Constantine* had embraced the Christian Religion.

They celebrated Fasts that were very different as to their duration; some ending after Three of the Clock in the Afternoon, some lasting the whole day, but all of them consisted in a total abstinence from meat and drink. Some of these Fasts were kept every week, on *Wednesday* and *Friday*; the Church of *Rome* fasted also on *Saturday*. These days of fasting having not been instituted by the Authority of the Apostles, according to the general consent of Antient Christians, and every one using them with great Liberty.

The Body of the Christian Churches continued united together by the Bond of one and the same Faith, and by the mutual cares every Bishop took to keep up the same Zeal for the Purity of Manners, as for that of Faith. If there happened any difference, the Bishops and the Priest of the same Province assembled, and determined the matter, without any Appeal: and it was not till the midst of the Fourth Century, when the Dioceses were better formed, that the Council of *Sardica* granted to Pope *Julius*, Bishop of *Rome*, the priviledge of examining afresh all causes that had been determined in the Provincial Synods; which however never took full effect, all the *Greeks*, and a great part of the *Latins* having rejected that Canon. The Bishops of *Rome* endeavoured to attribute and preserve to themselves this Authority, though they could never bring it about, but by means of the favour of the Emperours *Theodosius*, at the end of the Fourth Age, and of *Valentinian* the Third, in the midst of the Fifth Age.

This was the general state of the Church, whilst under the Heathen Persecutions, and after having endured the Furies of Arianism, which almost wholly laid her waste, during the Fourth Century. On which occasion I desire the Reader to observe,

First, That the most part of the humane constitutions I have mentioned, were not observed with that Rigour, with which *Rome* imposeth them at present.

Secondly, That some part of those Church-Orders have been changed and abolished in process of time.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, That a conſiderable part of theſe Cuſtoms, unknown to Scripture, had their riſe from a deſign the Chriſtians had, of accommodating themſelves to the notions of the *Jews* and *Heathens*.

Fourthly, That the Opinions amongſt the Antient Chriſtians upon many Queſtions of Divinity being very different, they made uſe of great forbearance one with another, as long as they did but agree in matters of Faith.

Fifthly, That although they received not Men, excommunicated for ſcandalous manners in another Dioceſs; notwithſtanding the Excommunications of one Dioceſs, did not hinder, but that thoſe who could prove the injuſtice thereof, might communicate with thoſe, whom the Biſhops of another Dioceſs had Excommunicated.

Sixthly, That every Dioceſs was lookt upon, as being independent of all other Authority: ſo that what reſpect ſoever they might have for the Apoſtolical Churches, yet did not they think themſelves obliged to follow them, in caſe they were perſwaded, that they had violated the Purity of the Faith.

And now having made theſe general Obſervations, which are to be applied to the ſtate of the Dioceſs of *Italy* in particular, we ſhall proceed to what farther information we can get from thoſe Authors who have wrote and lived in this Dioceſs.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Opinions of Authors of the Dioceſs of Italy, *in the Fourth Century, concerning matters of Faith and Worſhip.*

FOraſmuch as the Doctors of the Roman Church generally acknowledge that the Church of this Dioceſs continued pure until the Fourth Century, and that it enjoyed the Communion of the Pope of *Rome*; it will not be needful particularly to examine, what was the Faith of that Dioceſs, about the Articles which the Church of *Rome* rejects or receives in common with Proteſtants. Our buſineſs, to ſpeak properly, being only to enquire concerning thoſe Articles and ways of worſhip, which the Church of *Rome* conſiders, as making a part of their Religion, and which the Proteſtants reject, as being more proper to corrupt, than perfect it. If it be then certain and evident that the Believers of that Dioceſs, were either altogether ignorant of, or formally rejected thoſe Articles of Faith and that worſhip, which the Church of *Rome* preſcribes to its People, and which ſhe impoſeth on the reſt of the World under pain of Damnation; it will moſt evidently appear by this, that theſe Believers were not of the Romiſh Religion, but that in reſpect of their Faith and Worſhip, they were true Proteſtants.

And of this it is eaſie to convince an unprejudiced Reader, by examining Century after Century the writings of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors of that Dioceſs. I begin with St. *Ambroſe*, who died *Anno* 397. after having poſſeſs'd the See of *Milan* Twenty three Years. This great Man (whoſe Elogy is ſet down by *Caſſiodore* in three words when he calls him *Virtutum Epiſcopum, Arcem Fidei, Oratorem Catholicum*; the Biſhop of Virtues, the Caſtle of Faith, the

the Catholick Orator) can inform us, whether or no his Dioceſs embraced thoſe Maxims which the Proteſtants, in conformity with the *Waldenſes*, do condemn in the Church of *Rome*.

If we deſire to know what he believed concerning the Fulneſs and Sufficiency of the Scripture, he maintains, That there we are to learn that which makes the Object of our Faith; becauſe therein the Father, the Son, the Prophets and the Apoſtles, ſatisfie and anſwer the Queſtions of Believers. *Lib.* 1. *de fide, ad Gratian. c.* 4.

Would you know, according to what Standard he believ'd the Verſions of the Scripture ought to be examined? He will anſwer you, That it muſt be by the Original. Lib. 2. *de Spir. S.* cap. 6. *& de incarnat.* cap. 8.

If the Scripture ſeems any where obſcure, What is to be done in this Caſe, according to his Judgment? We are to compare the ſeveral paſſages, *Et aperietur*, ſaith he, *non ab alio, ſed à Dei verbo*; and it ſhall be opened to thee, not from another, but from the Word of God, in *Pſalm* 118. *Serm.* 8.

See here one of his Maxims, concerning what is maintained at this day, about the Succeſſion of the Biſhop of *Rome*, to the Rights of St. *Peter*: thoſe who have not the Faith of *Peter*, neither can they pretend to the Inheritance of *Peter*, *lib.* 1. *de Pœnit. c.* 6. And indeed, How could he have ſpoke otherwiſe, after the Apoſtaſie of *Liberius* to the Hereſie of the *Arians*? Neither do we find him acknowledging any other Rock of the Church, beſides Jeſus Chriſt, or other Foundation of the Church, but the true Faith; for ſo he expreſſeth himſelf in *Luc.* 1. *c.* 9. *& lib.* 5. *Epiſt.* 32.

He conſiders the Juſtification of a Sinner, as conſiſting in the Remiſſion of Sins, *De Jacob. & vita beata, lib.* 1. *c.* 5, 6. and in other places.

He leaves no room for the Merit of Works, and maintains, That all our Glory conſiſts in the Remiſſion of our Offences. *De Bono Mortis, c.* 2.

He

He maintains, That the alone Sufferings of Jesus Christ are the means of our Justification, without any concurrence of our own good Works: *Ecce Agnus Dei qui tollit peccata Mundi, & ideo nemo glorietur in operibus, quia nemo factis suis justificabitur. Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the Sins of the World, and therefore let no man glory in his Works, because no man shall be justified by his own doings*, Epist. 71. Lib. 9.

Would you know whether St. *Ambrose* did believe the Seven Sacraments, as does the Church of *Rome*; you need only call to mind, that St. *Augustin*, who had been his Disciple, own'd only two, *viz. Baptism*, and the *Supper of the Lord.*

He took care to distinguish that which is visibly done, from that which is invisibly celebrated; so far was he from tying Grace to the Sacraments themselves, as the Church of *Rome* does. *Epist. 84. & de Spiritu Sancto*, lib. 3. cap. 11.

Let any one judge, whether he did believe the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, when he wrote these words, in *Luc. lib.* 10. *c.* 24. *Seek those things which are on high, where Jesus Christ is seated at the right hand of God.* And, lest we should believe, That it is rather the Duty of the Eyes, than of the Soul he here speaks of; He adds, *Savour the things that are on high, and not those that are on the Earth.* So then, it is not on the Earth, nor in the Earth, nor according to the Flesh, that we must seek him, if we would find him. Lastly, *Stephen* did not look for Christ upon Earth; *Stephen* touched him, because he sought him in Heaven. Jesus Christ is present, according to the manner of our seeking him.

'Tis well known, that in his time the Church communicated under two kinds: Besides, he overthrows the possibility of a Body existing in more places at once: He maintains, That the Gospel has only the Image, and not the Truth; and in several places he explodes the Carnal Manducation, which the Church of *Rome* admits of.

This makes it very evident, that he knew nothing of the Sacrifice of the Mass: Indeed, he formally opposes the

the ſame, and maintains, *lib.* 1. *de Offic. c.* 41. That ſince his Paſſion, he offers up himſelf only by way of repreſentation, as being really and in truth in Heaven, where, as our Advocate, he intercedes for us.

If we read the Death of St. *Ambroſe*, related by *Paulinus* in his Life, we ſhall find nothing there, either of Confeſſion, or of Adoration of the Euchariſt, when he received it, or of Extream Unction practis'd there; no more than at the death of a true Proteſtant.

Would we know his Thoughts concerning the Religious Worſhip of Creatures, he is the Author of this Maxim, That we may not ſerve any Creature, a Foundation to prove, that Jeſus Chriſt is God, becauſe the Scripture teaches us, that we ought to worſhip him. *De fide ad Gratian. lib.* 1. *c.* 7. And 'tis with reſpect to the ſame that he proves, That the Holy Ghoſt is God, becauſe he has Temples. *De Spir. Sancto, lib.* 3. *c.* 13. As to the uſe of Images in Religious Worſhip, ſee how eloquently he expreſſes himſelf, *de fuga ſeculi, c.* 5. *Holy* Rachel *bid the Images, that is to ſay, the Church or Wiſdom, becauſe the Church does not own the vain Repreſentations and Figures of Images.* He tells you, that *Helen* worſhipt Jeſus Chriſt, and not the Wood of his Croſs, which ſhe had found; for that is a Pagan Errour, and a Vanity of Ungodly Men, *Conc. de obitu Theodoſii.* He maintains, That it is pure Paganiſm to worſhip Stones, and to implore the aſſiſtance of Images, that have no underſtanding, *lib.* 1. *de Offic. c.* 26.

Do we ſuppoſe he attributed to Miniſters the power of pardoning Sins? We may undeceive our ſelves, by hearing him deliver himſelf like a Proteſtant, thus: *Men afford their Miniſtry for the Remiſſion of Sins, but do not exerciſe the Right of any Power; they pray, but God pardons,* l. 3. *de ſpir. ſancto,* c. 18. He aſſerts, That the Miniſtry may be in the hands of Hereticks, and this without corrupting the Faith of the People, the Ears of the People being more wiſe than the Mouth of the Preachers; as happened at the time when *Arianiſm* ſeemed to prevail. In *Pſal.* 118. *ſerm.* 17.

He ſets down for a certain Maxim, That we are bound to ſeparate our ſelves from a Church that rejects the Faith, and does not poſſeſs the Foundation of the Preaching of the Apoſtles. *Lib. 6. in Lucam, cap. 9.*

We may ſee, that he was wholly eſtranged from that Maxim which the Papiſts have maintain'd theſe laſt 600 years, That the Church hath the Power of depoſing a Prince who is turn'd Heretick; for he maintains, That the Church has no other Arms but Prayers and Remonſtrances, or at the moſt Excommunications.

T. 4. B. P. p. 12. I paſs on to *Philaſtrius* Biſhop of *Breſcia*, contemporary with St. *Ambroſe*, from whoſe Writings we may gather theſe following particulars. He did not believe that the Church of *Rome* could authorize the Canon of Scripture, as the Gloſs maintains; for he aſſerts, That the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors determin'd the number of the Canonical Books, which only ought to be read in the Church. *Her.* 40.

It is plain, he did not believe the Church of *Rome* to be exempt from Error, if he minded what he ſaid; becauſe, *Hæreſ.* 41. he rejects as Heretical the Opinion of thoſe who held the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to have been writ by *Barnabas*, by *Clemens Romanus*, or by St. *Luke*, which had given occaſion to make the Authority thereof, ſuſpected and doubtful in the Roman Church, which rejected the ſame. As we may ſee by the Teſtimony of St. *Jerome*.

He did not believe, that it belong'd only to the Church of *Rome* to condemn Hereſies, which power ſhe arrogates to her ſelf at this day; becauſe he obſerves, concerning ſeveral Hereſies, That the particular Biſhops or Councils of the Dioceſs, where the Hereſie firſt appeared, had right to condemn them.

So little did he think, that it was the Right of the Church of *Rome* only to canonize the Verſions of Scripture by her Authority, that he fixeth the Brand of Hereſie upon the Opinion of thoſe who did not receive the Verſion of the *Septuagint*; whereas it was the only Verſion the Church admitted of in his time, *Hæreſ.* 89, 90. One may

ſee

ſee by this whether he was like to have rejected the ſame upon the Popes determination.

We cannot find that he believ'd Tranſubſtantiation, for giving an account of the Hereſie of the *Artotyrites*, who celebrated the Euchariſt with Bread and Cheeſe, he doth not, to condemn them, make uſe of the Reaſons which a Tranſubſtantiator might have alledged, *Hæreſ.* 27. And we ought to make the ſame Reflection on the 30*th.* Hereſie of the *Aquarii*, who celebrated the Euchariſt with Water only, which at leaſt they might defend by way of Concomitance; but might, on the other hand, be more ſtrongly attack'd, by the Idolatry which would have been committed by adoring the Water in the Sacrament.

He would never have imployed in defence of the Real Preſence, the Acts of St. *Andrew*, which they now adays object to us, to eſtabliſh the Carnal Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt, foraſmuch as he maintains, *Hæreſ.* 40. that thoſe Acts had been feigned by the Manichees.

We find not, when he ſpeaks of *Aetius*, *Hæreſ.* 25. that he lookt upon his Opinion againſt Prayers for the Dead, to be an Hereſie.

It is evident, he did not approve of the Principles of Idolworſhippers, becauſe he calls their Opinion an Hereſie, who thought that man was the Image of God, according to his Body, and not according to his Soul. *Hæreſ.* 49.

It appears from *Hæreſ.* 53. that he did not admit of the Romiſh Divinity, concerning the Puniſhments properly ſo called, which God, ſay they, makes his Children to ſuffer during the courſe of this life.

He lays it down for a Rule, *Hæreſ.* 60, 61, That the *Chriſtian Faith* is more ancient than the *Jewiſh*; which can no longer now be maintain'd, ſince the Church of *Rome* has been pleaſed to add ſo many Articles to the Creed, and introduced into its Worſhip ſo many Practices contrary to the Law of God.

He declares expreſly, That the Sacrifice of the Church is a Sacrifice of Bread *in Myſterium Chriſti*, to be a Myſtery of Jeſus Chriſt. *Hæreſ.* 96.

He was ſo ſenſible with the Proteſtants, that the Children of Believers have a Right to the Covenant, that he maintains, *Hæreſ.* 69. That formerly the Patriarchs, Judges, and other Believers, were ſanctified in their Mothers Belly. A Doctrine which has ſo extreamly diſguſted the *Romiſh* Cenſors, that they thought fit to guard the Margent with a *Cautè lege.*

He aſſerts, *Hæreſ.* 74. That he who call'd upon the Father, before Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh, was thereby freed from the condemnation of the Wicked; which does not ſeem to agree very well with the Popiſh Doctrine of a *Limbus Patrum*; or elſe it muſt be owned, That the *Limbus* muſt take place as well under the New Teſtament, as under the old: becauſe he makes uſe of the words of Jeſus Chriſt, or, at leaſt, makes a plain alluſion to them.

He overthrows the Doctrine of Merit, in maintaining, *Hæreſ.* 77. That it is by the ſole Mercy of Jeſus Chriſt we are ſaved, *non virtute & juſtitiâ condignâ*, not by any condign Virtue and Righteouſneſs of our own.

It does not appear that he own'd a Purgatory, ſuch as the *Romaniſts* do, becauſe, *Hæreſ.* 73. he ſaith, That the Soul of Man, whether good or bad, whether godly or ungodly, is conducted by an Angel to its appointed place, there to receive according to what he has done in this Life. It is evident from the Epiſtle of St. *Gaudentius* to *Benevolus*, that he believed a Fire, through which the moſt Righteous, even the Apoſtles and Bleſſed Virgin her ſelf, were to paſs, at the end of the World: Which Opinion has been ſince rejected in the *Weſt.*

It appears from *Hæreſ.* 97. That the number of Faſts was very ſmall in his time; he takes notice only of four, that of *Chriſtmas*, *Epiphany*, *Eaſter*, and *Whitſuntide*, beſides that of *Lent*, the reſt were left to the Devotion of Believers: And there is great probability that theſe Faſts were only obſerved on the Eves before the Communion.

True it is, that he ſpeaks of a local deſcent of the Soul of our Savlour Jeſus Chriſt into Hell, *Hæreſ.* 22. but in *Hæreſ.* 73. he terms their Opinion an Hereſie, who maintain, That

That after his Death he deſcended into Hell, and preached the Goſpel, that the Souls there receiving the ſame, might be ſaved: Which was the Opinion of moſt of the Ancients, both before and after him. Whence we may judge, whether this Article, about which ſo much pains has been taken to explain it in a good ſence, was a Doctrine which the Apoſtles had left in the Church; or, whether it was not drawn from ſome paſſages of Scripture, ill underſtood in the Second Century, as we aſſert, becauſe the Fathers did not at all times, in all places, and with all agree therein; which is the Character of a Doctrine truly Catholick, according to the famous Maxim of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*.

And, foraſmuch as St. *Gaudentius* ſucceeded *Philaſtrius*, whom he calls a moſt Apoſtolical Man, 'tis no wonder to find him ſo cloſely following his ſteps; for we find him every where of the ſame opinion with St. *Gaudentius*, in the points he treats of; as I have already made it appear from his Epiſtle to *Benevolus*; for, writing to him a conſolatory Letter, upon occaſion of his Sickneſs, he treats the matter altogether like a Proteſtant, without mingling any Popiſh Notions therewith, ſuch as are, the conſidering of the Afflictions of Believers, as puniſhments and ſatisfactions God exacts from them as a Judge; as may be ſeen in that Epiſtle. It is true, that amongſt other things he obſerves, That they ſerve alſo to leſſen the force of the purgative fire of the laſt Judgment. But I have ſhewed what he meant by that, and the ſame is acknowledged by the Learned of the Roman Church. He lays down two things in the ſame Epiſtle, the one is, That the Boſom of *Abraham* ſignifies Eternal Life, which does no ſervice to the Popiſh Polemical Writers; the other is, That neither Angels nor Men know the Secrets of Conſcience, that being the Priviledge of God only; which Maxim wholly overthrows the Invocation of Angels, as well as the Authority the Prieſts arrogate to themſelves of pardoning Sins, as Judges. But we'll paſs on to his Sermons, and inſtance in ſome other of his Opinions.

He tells us plainly in his firſt Sermon, That we ſhall not eat the true *Manna*, which is Jeſus Chriſt, till after the Re-

Reſurrection in Heaven, where we ſhall drink of the Rock, which is Jeſus Chriſt, cleaving to the feet of that immaculate Lamb. Is this the Language of a man that believes the Carnal Preſence?

The whole of his ſecond Sermon is ſpent in explaining the Doctrine of the Euchariſt, where at the firſt he lays down, That the Figure is not the Truth, but an imitation of it. He ſaith, Jeſus Chriſt has ſuffered death for all men, and that he feeds them in all the Churches; But how? *In myſterio panis & vini reficit immolatus, vivificat creditus; He refreſheth, being offered up in the Myſtery of Bread and Wine; and quickens, being believed on:* So that he is only offered up in figure, and not truly, and only quickens thoſe that believe his Word. And he explains himſelf, by declaring, That the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt is the Fleſh of that immaculate Lamb, the whole body of the Scriptures containing the Son of God. He explains that Phraſe *To receive the Body of the Son of God*, by receiving with the Mouth the Myſtery of the Body and Blood of the Lord. He maintains, That it was of the conſecrated Bread that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Body*; which, according to the Doctors of *Rome*, overthrows Tranſubſtantiation. Laſtly, he maintains, That Jeſus Chriſt made choice of the Bread and Wine, to make them the Sacraments of his Body and Blood, that there might be no Blood in this new Sacrifice, and to figure the Body of the Church, which is compoſed of many Believers, as the Bread is made up of many Grains. Can any thing be ſaid more contrary to the Maxims of the Church of *Rome*?

In his third Sermon he aſſerts, That the Church reſembles the Moon, which encreaſes in times of Peace, and decreaſeth in times of Perſecution; that ſhe decreaſeth with reſpect to her fulneſs, but not with reſpect to her brightneſs. He ſeems after her fulneſs, to which ſhe was arrived, to foreſee her wain and decreaſe, which he had already had a view of, during the Reign of *Arianiſm*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Faith of the Churches of the Dioceſs of Italy, *during the Fifth Century.*

ONe of the moſt illuſtrious Witneſſes we have of the Belief of the Churches of *Italy*, at the beginning of the Fifth Age, is *Ruſinus* Presbyter of *Aquileia*.

As for the Rule of Faith, which is the Scripture, *Ruſinus* ſets down a Catalogue of the Books of Holy Writ, the ſame that is at preſent received by the Proteſtants, calling the Books that we reject Apocryphal; *apud Cypr.* p. 552, & 553. which is an evident mark, that the Church of *Italy* made a more accurate diſtinction of the Canonical Books from the Apocryphal, than the Church of *Rome* at that time did. So that *Ruſinus*, in this reſpect, knew more than *Innocent* I. who began to confound the Canonical Writings, by a mixture of the Apocryphal.

As for the Creed, which is an Abridgment of the Articles of our belief, we cannot meet with a more Orthodox Explication of it, than is that of *Ruſinus*; and, would to God the Church of *Rome* would keep to that, for then we ſhould be ſoon agreed, at leaſt, in ſo doing ſhe would not propoſe any thing to Chriſtians, which was not owned for the Creed of the Ancient Church; whereas ſince She has added new Articles, altogether unknown to *Ruſinus*, and the Biſhops of that Dioceſs. In a word, we may ſay it is moſt certain, that there is as much difference between this Treatiſe of *Ruſinus* and the Catechiſm of the Council of *Trent*, as there is between the Catechiſm of the Proteſtants and that of the Papiſts.

I own, That *Ruſinus* in this Explication of the Creed aſſerts a local deſcent of Jeſus Chriſt into Hell: But we are to obſerve, that though already in his time this was lookt upon as an Article of Faith; yet the Fathers, as well thoſe that went

went before, as those that followed after, had such different notions concerning it, that the Church of *Rome*, which at this day follows one of those Opinions, but had not that Article in her Symbol, in *Rufinus* his time; can scarcely draw any advantage from thence, except only against those who hold, that this Article is only an allegorical Explication of the Article, *He was buried.*

P. 53. 8. But however, we may observe, that *Rufinus* expressly notes, at the beginning of this his Exposition of the Creed, That *Believers* received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper with an extraordinary respect, *maxima cum observantia*, but not worshipping it, as the Church of *Rome* does at this day.

Though we have no remains of St. *Chromatius* Bishop of *Aquileia*, save only some Commentaries and Homilies; yet from thence we are sufficiently informed how far his Divinity differ'd from that which is now professed by the Church of *Rome*. He plainly asserts the perspicuity of the Scriptures, when he accuses the Hereticks and Jews of darkening it by their perverse Explications, *Serm.* 2. *pag.* 162. Accordingly he also maintains, That the Lord's Prayer contains all things necessary to Salvation, *p.* 175. which is not very agreeable to the Palate of the Doctors of *Rome*, who furnish us with a far greater number. He asserts, That the Prison from whence there is no coming out until the last Farthing be paid, is Hell, which does not at all suit with Popish *Purgatory*, 166. Conformably to this, he lays down, That the Afflictions which happen to the Faithful, are either to correct their Defects, or to try their Faith, or to prepare them for Glory; not a word concerning the Use the *Roman* Church puts them to, *viz.* for the expiation of Sin, and for a satisfaction properly so called. He acknowledges indeed, that the *Christian Church* is typified by a City, situated upon a Mountain; but we do not find him concluding from thence its equal visibility, no more than St. *Ambrose*. We are not to forget here, that St. *Chromatius* had so little deference for the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, that *Rufinus* having been condemned by Pope *Anastasius*, because he seemed to favour the *Origenists*, St. *Chromatius* took

took no notice of this Proceeding, but received him to his Communion, as before; an abundant Teſtimony that the Thunderbolts of *Rome*, at that time, reached no further than the ten Provinces in ſubjection to the Pope, St. *Chromatius*'s Biſhoprick being without them, and conſequently, that he did not own the Pope for the *Head* of the Church, out of whoſe Communion Salvation was not to be hoped for.

He plainly aſſerts, That Marriage is ſo wholly diſſolved by Adultery, that it is lawful for the innocent Party to marry again. Which was the Opinion of the Romiſh Church till after the Tenth Century, *p.* 168. *A. B.* He maintains it to be a piece of Impiety, to ſwear by any Creatures; which is not the Faith of *Rome* at this day, *pag.* 169. *A.* He owns no other Union in the Church, but the Unity of the Catholick Faith, *ibid. p.* 158. We find, by all his Expreſſions, that the Carnal Preſence was unknown to him: Firſt, He propoſeth Jeſus Chriſt as the Meat and Drink of the Believer, that comes hungry to it. *Conc.* 2. *p.* 157. Secondly, he holds, That a change is made when *ex eo quod fuit in aliam ſpeciem generatur*; out of that which was before, a thing of another kind is generated. Thirdly, He applies, *pag.* 174. our daily Bread to the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, but he conſiders it ſpiritually, which makes it appear what notion he had of the Manducation or eating of it, and that the expreſſion he uſeth of *à corpore Domini ſeparari*, ſignifies nothing elſe but the excluſion from the Sacrament.

Moreover, if we find, that he has been a Guide of the *Waldenſes*, towards truth, it will not be amiſs withal to obſerve, that he ſeems to have ſuggeſted to them a wrong underſtanding of the Scripture. For this great man maintains, That the Goſpel abſolutely forbids ſwearing, *pag.* 168. and the Letter of Scripture ſo far impoſed upon him, that he pretends we are obliged, according to the Law of Jeſus Chriſt, to offer the other cheek to him that has already ſtruck us, *p.* 169, & 170.

Niceas Biſhop of *Aquileia*, who lived *Anno* 420. has a very remarkable expreſſion in his Book *ad Virginem lapſam*, which we find in the Works of St. *Ambroſe*. *Stick*

cleſe to the exercise of Repentance, till the end of thy life, and never think of obtaining Pardon ab humano die, *because he who has made thee make this Promise, has deceived thee. As thou haſt properly ſinned against the Lord, ſo ſeek thy Remedy only at his hands.* It is evident, that theſe words either are the Expreſſions of a downright *Novatian*, which we cannot ſuſpect him of, after the many Teſtimonies we have of his ſoundneſs in the Faith, or that they repreſent a very different notion from what has been entertained at *Rome*, ſince their eſpouſing the Secret of Auricular Confeſſion, and the prieſtly power of pardoning Sins, as Judges properly ſo called.

The remaining part of this Century was terribly agitated by the Diſputes raiſed upon occaſion of *Neſtorianiſm* and *Eutychianiſm*, inſomuch as the Biſhops were all divided, and the Council of *Chalcedon* was unable to appeaſe their Differences. The Dioceſs of *Italy* was at the ſame time ravaged by the *Huns*. *Attila* raſed *Aquileia*, deſtroyed *Milan*, *Pavia*, and divers other places. Some years after, *Odoacer* invaded the ſaid Dioceſs; and not long after, the *Goths* marched through it under the Command of *Theodorick*, ſo that ſcarcely was there any place leſt for learned men to write, during the inundation of theſe barbarous Nations. Proceed we therefore to the following Century.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Opinions of the Churches of Italy, *during the Sixth Century.*

ONE of the first that can give us any Information herein, is *Laurentius*, who was translated from the Bishoprick of *Novara* to that of *Milan*, about the year 507. We have three of his Pieces, which he preached upon his return to his See, after the destruction of *Milan*, and his own Banishment.

The first is a Sermon upon the *Canaanitish* Woman, his design therein being to administer comfort to repenting Sinners, and to assure them of the easiness of God's Mercy. *Mabillon*, who published them, tells us as much. I shall set down some of his Propositions or Doctrines which he borrowed from St. *Chrysostom*.

I. He requires nothing as necessary for the Remission of Sin, save only a lively compunction, without so much as one word of the Priests Absolution, *pag.* 24. [*Sed dicis, feci peccata multa & magna. Et quis est de hominibus qui non peccet? Tu dic; erravi super omnes homines, sufficit mihi in Sacrificio ista confessio. Dic tu prius iniquitates tuas, ut justificeris: cognosce quoniam peccatores; habe tristitiam cum converteris; esto ac si desperatus & mœstus, sed & lachrymas compunctus effunde. Numquid aliud aliquid fuit in Meretrice, quam lachrymarum effusio? & ex hac profusione invenit præsidium, & acceptâ fiducia accessit ad fontem Dominum Jesum.*] 'But thou wilt say, I have committed 'many and great Sins: And who is there amongst men 'that sinneth not? Say thou, I have sinned beyond all 'men; this confession is sufficient to me, for a Sacrifice. 'Do thou first declare thy Iniquities, that thou mayst be 'justified; acknowledge thy self to be a Sinner: be full of 'sorrow in this thy Conversion; yea, be grieved, and as 'without hope: moreover, pour forth Tears of compunc-

'on. Do you find ought elſe in her that had been a com-
'mon Harlot, but ſhedding of Tears, and by this her weeping
'ſhe found help; and having received confidence, ſhe drew
'near to the Fountain, our Lord Jeſus.

He anſwers the unworthineſs of Sinners in theſe words, *pag.* 25. [*Et quomodo auſa eſt mulier Legis ignara, tam iniqua, ſic abruptè accedere ad fontem ſalutis? Non petiit Jacobum, non rogavit Johannem, non acceſſit ad Petrum; ſed hoc intermittens, quid dicit? Non eſt mihi neceſſarius fidejuſſor: Suſcipit in ſe pœnitentiæ patrocinium, & ſola currit, tenet eum in voce ac dicit, miſerere mei Domine fili David. Ideo deſcendiſti, ideo carnem ſuſcepiſti, ut & ego loquar ad te & cum fiducia petam, &c.*] 'But how durſt a Woman 'ignorant of the Law, and beſides ſo wicked, ſo abruptly 'draw near to the fountain of Salvation? ſhe did not in-'treat *James*, nor ask *John*, neither came ſhe to *Peter* [to 'ſpeak for her.] But leaving all this, what ſaith ſhe? I 'have no need of a Sponſor. And taking upon her ſelf 'the patronage of her own Repentance, ſhe runs to him 'alone, ſtops him with her Voice, and ſaith, Lord have 'mercy upon me, thou Son of *David*. Therefore it is that 'thou cameſt down [to us,] therefore thou tookeſt Fleſh 'upon thee, that even I alſo might ſpeak to thee, and 'with confidence ask of thee, *&c.* See here a very exact imitation of St. *Chryſoſtome*, after *Nectarius* had taken away the uſe of Pœnitentiary Prieſts.

It is worth our taking notice how he ſpeaks of Prayers without attention, *pag.* 35. [*Sunt multi quidem qui intrant in Eccleſiam, & ſtrepunt in oratione, confuſè atque intemperatâ voce diſpergunt verba ſua, & egreſſi foras obliti ſunt omnia. Hi ſunt qui labiis hinniunt, & corde non concipiunt. Si tu ipſe dicta tua & preces ignoras; quomodo te exaudit Deus?*] 'There be many 'indeed that come into the Church, and make a noiſe in 'Prayer, ſcattering their words with a confuſed and rude 'bawling, who as ſoon as they are got abroad, quite forget 'all. Theſe are they who neigh with their Mouths, without 'conceiving in their Hearts. If thou thy ſelf doſt not know 'what thou ſayeſt or prayeſt, how ſhall God hear thee? From whence

whence we may eaſily judge, how he would have approved of praying in an unknown Tongue, which neceſſarily deſtroys Attention.

As concerning the place where we ought to pray, that we may be heard, he expreſſeth himſelf in this manner, as if he had deſigned to furniſh the *Waldenſes* with an anſwer, pag 36. [*Grandis ſermo eſt miſerere mei Deus, brevis quidem ſed virtute plenus. Nam & ſi foris fueris, clama & dic, miſerere mei Deus. Clama, non voce, ſed mente; nam & tacentes exaudit Deus. Nec tam locus quæritur, quantum ſenſus. Hieremias in Carcere confortatur; Daniel inter Leones exultat; tres pueri in fornace tripudiant; Job nudus ſub Divo triumphat, Paradiſum de Cruce Latro invenit. Quid ergo ſi fueris in publico foro? Ora intra te. Noli quærere locum, locus ipſe es, ibi ubi fueris ora. Si fueris in Balneo, ora, & ibi templum eſt.*] 'This is a great word, 'Lord have mercy upon me; ſhort indeed, but full of virtue. 'For though thou art abroad, yet cry and ſay, Lord have 'mercy upon me. Cry, not with thy voice, but with thy 'mind, for God hears even thoſe that are ſilent; neither 'does he regard the place where, but our mind and atten-'tion in Prayer. *Jeremiah* receives comfort in the Dun-'geon; *Daniel* rejoiceth in the Lyons Den; the three 'Young-men leap in the midſt of the fiery Furnace; *Job* 'naked and deſtitute, triumphs in the open Air; the Thief 'finds a Paradiſe upon the Croſs. What therefore though 'thou art in the publick Market? pray within thy ſelf; 'don't ſeek for another place, thou thy ſelf art a place; where-so-'ever therefore thou art, there pray. If thou be in the 'Bath, pray there, for there alſo is the Church. And, p. 37. [*Nunquid homo eſt Deus, ut labore quæratur per loca diverſa? Deus eſt qui adeſt ubique? Si quæris hominem, dicitur tibi non eſt hic, aut non illic vacat: non eſt ſic in cauſa Dei; hoc tantum eſt ut dicas, miſerere mei Deus, & ipſe propè eſt ut te liberet, & adhuc loquente te dicit, ecce adſum.*] 'What! is God a Man then 'that thou muſt take pains to ſeek him in ſeveral pla-'ces? 'Tis God who is preſent every where. If indeed 'thou chanceſt to look for a man, thou art anſwered, He 'is not here, or he is not at leiſure: but the Caſe is not

'ſo

'ſo with God. Do thou only ſay, Lord have mercy upon 'me, and he is near thee to deliver thee, and whilſt thou art 'yet ſpeaking, ſaith to thee, Behold here am I.

The ſecond Homily publiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, *T.* 3. utterly overthrows the pretended Tribunal of Penance, *pag.* [*Mox ut aſcendiſti de fonte, veſtitus es veſte albâ, & unctus es unguento Myſtico; facta eſt ſuper te invocatio, & venit ſuper te trina virtus, quam vas novum hâc nova perfundis doctrina, exinde teipſum tibi ſtatuit judicem & arbitrum.*] 'As ſoon as thou art come up from the Fountain, thou art 'clothed with white Raiment, and anointed with the Myſti-'cal Ointment; Prayers have been made over thee, and 'the threefold Virtue is come upon thee; after that thy new 'veſſel is once fill'd with this new Doctrine, thenceforward 'he has conſtituted thee a judge and diſpoſer for thy 'ſelf.

In the third Homily, which treats of Alms, he makes uſe of this Expreſſion, [*In Jordane Chriſtus ſemel tinctus, ſanctificavit aquas, in pauperibus autem ſemper manet, & aſſiduè abluit crimina largientium.*] 'Chriſt being once dipt in 'the River *Jordan*, thereby ſanctified the Waters; but he 'always abides in the Poor, and continually waſheth away 'the ſins of thoſe that give to them. This notion of the Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Poor, ſufficiently makes out the ſenſe of the Fathers, when they ſpeak of the Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt; eſpecially if we joyn with it, that expreſſion of his ſecond Homily, *p.* 127. *B.* [*Aſperges me aquâ filii tui ſacro ſanguine mixta.*] 'Thou wilt ſprinkle 'me with the Water mingled with the Holy Blood of 'thy Son.

The Opinions of *Ennodius*, Biſhop of *Pavia*, are evident in ſeveral of his Works, we ſhall inſtance the following places.

We find in the Life of St. *Epiphanius* Biſhop of *Pavia*, writ by *Ennodius*, a repreſentation of the manner how that Biſhop did celebrate the Euchariſt, which makes it apparent how far he was from adoring the Euchariſt as his God. *Junctis pedibus uſque ad Conſummationem myſtici operis ſtare*

ſe

ſe debere conſtituit, ita ut humore veſtigiorum locum ſuum depingeret, & longè aſpicientibus indicaret. 'He had purpoſed 'with himſelf, ſaith he, always to ſtand ſtill, with his Feet 'together, till he had finiſhed that Myſtical Work, ſo that 'the moiſture of his footſteps, deciphred the place of his 'ſtanding, and might be ſeen by thoſe who were at a con-'ſiderable diſtance. It is but too viſible here, that St. *Epiphanius* and *Ennodius* knew nothing of thoſe proſtrations, which now are uſed before the Sacrament; becauſe the one of them preſcribed this conſtant form to himſelf, in celebrating the Euchariſt; and the other commends him for it, as a Mark of his Piety.

At the end of the ſaid Life, *Ennodius* gives us an account of the Death of St. *Epiphanius*, much like that of a Proteſtant Biſhop. He had only this word in his Mouth, *Mihi vivere Chriſtus eſt, & mori lucrum*, To me to live is Chriſt, and to die is gain. He was heard to repeat nothing but Pſalms of Conſolation, ſuch as the 88. Pſalm; and he breathed his laſt in theſe words, *In manus tuas Domine commendo Spiritum meum*, Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my Spirit; taken out of Pſalm 30. He tells us in plain terms, That his Soul returned to Heaven, *Ad ſedem ſuam cœleſtis anima remeavit*; his heavenly Soul returned to its own place. All which ſerves to make out that Prayer for the Dead, had not as yet the belief of Purgatory for its foundation, as it hath at this day.

And it was in the ſame mind that he compos'd the Epitaph of St. *Victor*, Biſhop of *Noarre*, where we read theſe Verſes;

Hic reddens tumulis cineres, ad celſa vocatus
Spiritus, ætherea congaudet lucidus arce.

Having bequeath'd his Duſt to Duſt,
His Soul is call'd on high:
There bright and glorious, to partake
Thoſe Joys which never die.

And

And foraſmuch as we ſee that he in divers places commends St. *Ambroſe* and his Succeſſors for Orthodox Biſhops, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to quote any more of his Writings; and the rather becauſe the moſt part of his Works were Letters or Poems relating rather to outward affairs, than any matters of Religion.

I know they are wont to cite a Paſſage of *Ennodius*, to prove that the Pope cannot be judged by any one but God. We find nothing more frequent ſince the time of *Gratian* and the Canoniſts, than to quote theſe words of his Apology for *Symmachus*; *Aliorum hominum cauſas Deus voluit per homines terminari, ſed Romanæ ſedis præſulem, ſuo, ſine quæſtione, reſervavit arbitrio.* 'Other Mens caſes 'God was willing ſhould be determined by Men, but 'as for the Biſhop of *Rome*, he has reſerved his caſe 'for his own Cognizance, without expoſing it to a Judi-'cial Tryal. But they ſignifie nothing leſs, than what they ſeem to expreſs thus ſeparate from the reſt of the Diſcourſe. What *Ennodius* by theſe terms would declare, is ſimply this; That Pope *Symmachus* his Adverſaries, not having been able to convince him of the horrible Crimes whereof they had accuſed him before King *Theodoric*, and afterwards before the Synod aſſembled by *Theodoric*, for examining his Accuſation, his caſe had been remitted to the Judgment of God as was cuſtomary, when perſons could not be convicted by the ordinary courſe of Judiciary proceedings. *De Launoy* hath ſo ſolidly proved that this was *Ennodius* his meaning, though of a long time it hath been diſguiſed, that there is no need to inſiſt further upon it. *T.* 1. *Epiſt.* 9.

Dacius, Biſhop of *Milan*, has left ſo little in writing, that it may ſeem needleſs to ſpeak of it; only it may be to the purpoſe to obſerve the Carriage of *Juſtinian* towards him, who finding him at *Conſtantinople*, would make him (as well as the Pope's Referendary) ſubſcribe the Edict which he had publiſhed: which ſhews that he lookt upon himſelf, as the Head of a Dioceſs, which was as exempt and ſeparate from the Pope of *Rome's* Juriſdiction, as the Dioceſes

Dioceſes of the Patriarchs of the Eaſt were. *Baronius ad Annum* 546. §. 46.

In the Year 590. the Biſhops of *Italy* and of the *Griſons*, to the number of Nine, rejected the Communion of the Pope, as of an Heretick, who had conſented to the aboliſhing of the Council of *Chalcedon*, conſenting under *Juſtinian* to the Condemnation of the Three Chapters, as may be ſeen from their Letter to the Emperor *Mauritius*, ſet down by *Baronius*, *ad h. Annum n.* 29. That Emperour having ordered them to be preſent at the Council of *Rome*, they were diſpenſed with by the ſame Emperour, upon their proteſting that they could not communicate with Pope *Gregory* the Firſt. This Schiſm had already continued from the Year 553. and laſted near as long after; ſo little were they perſwaded at that time of the Popes infallibility, that to loſe Communion with them, was to loſe the Communion of the Church, or that they held their Ordinations from the hand of the Popes, and from the Biſhops ſubjected to their Juriſdiction. Let us proceed now to the Belief of the following Century.

CHAP. VI.

Opinions of the Dioceſs of Italy, *during the Seventh Century.*

I Know only of two or three Authors that can inſtruct us in this matter, the one is *Maurus*, Biſhop of *Ravenna*, who flouriſhed in the midſt of the VII. Century; the other *Manſuetus*, Biſhop of *Milan*, who flouriſhed towards the end of it, *viz.* from the Year 677. Of the firſt of theſe we have an Epiſtle againſt the *Monothelites*, which has been inſerted in the Council of *Lateran*, under *Martin* the Firſt,

in the Year 649. *Act.* 1. Of the second we have an Epiſtle to the Emperour *Conſtantine*, ſet down in the ſame Council. The Union of them both, with the Biſhops of *Rome*, for the defence of the Faith againſt the *Monothelites*, is a ſtrong aſſurance of their purity in the Faith. Their Opinions are theſe that follow.

Maurus who ſtiles himſelf *Servus ſervorum Dei*, preciſely obſerves, that the Pope had invited him to be preſent at *Rome* at the Council, but as a Biſhop without his Dioceſs; for otherwiſe he might, as being one of his Suffragans, by his Authority have ſummoned him thither. And indeed inſtead of going to *Rome* in Perſon, he ſent in his place *Maurus*, Biſhop of *Ceſena*, with one of the Prieſts of *Milan. ibid. pag.* 601. He declares that the only means of preſerving the Purity of the Faith, is, to keep to the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, which the Fathers had followed, with reſpect had to the fifth General Council. The words he uſeth are theſe, *T.* 6. *Conc. pag.* 96. [*Hoc cum omnibus & ſingulare eſt Redemptores Dei, & Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, conceſſum Remedium ad animarum noſtrarum ſalutem, ut ea quæ per Apoſtolorum prædicationem percepimus, & Patrum doctrinam, proculdubio teneamus.*] 'The only 'and particular Remedy granted to all for the Salva- 'tion of our Souls, by God our Redeemer, and the Lord 'Jeſus Chriſt, is that, without all doubt, we hold faſt the 'things we have received by the preaching of the Apoſtles, 'and the Doctrine of the Fathers. He declares that he owns and admits the five General Councils, and that he condemns that which was held at *Conſtantinople* in favour of the *Monothelites*, being ſupported by the Credit of the Emperors.

Maximus, Biſhop of *Aquileia*, expreſſeth the ſame Opinions; and moreover expreſly condemns by name the *Monothelite* Biſhops, *Cyrus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus* and *Paul*, *p.* 97.

Manſuetus, in his Epiſtle to the Emperor *Conſtantine Pogonatus*, declares, Firſt, That it was *Conſtantine* the Great, who convened the Council of *Nice*, which at this day is very ſtiffly conteſted by the Church of *Rome*; that the Emperor *Theodoſius* called together the ſecond Council of *Conſtantinople*,

Conſtantinople, and that the Emperor *Martianus* did the ſame with regard to the Council of *Chalcedon*, and *Juſtinian* to the fifth general Council.

He declares, That the whole Faith of his Church is contained in the Apoſtles Creed; whereof the Confeſſion of Faith by him ſent to the Emperor, is only an Explication. Which makes it evident that the Church of *Milan*, and his Dioceſs, under the Reigns of *Perthari* and *Cunibert*, Kings of the *Lombards*, did not own any other Doctrine to belong to the Faith and of neceſſary Belief, ſave only what was contained in the Apoſtles Creed; much leſs did his Church own that heap of Doctrines which *Pius* the Fourth thought good of his own head to ſuperadd to it.

True it is that he praiſeth the antient Doctors of the Church, *Leo* I. St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Baſil*, &c. *Quicquid hi docuerunt*, ſaith he, *ſapuerunt, pradicaverunt, vel defenſores extiterunt, nos eorum acta vel ſtatuta omni devotione ſuſcipimus.* 'Whatſoever they have taught, judged, preach-'ed or defended, all that we receive with all devotion. Yet however this is not ſo general as it ſeems to be, becauſe his words have a particular reference to their Explications concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, againſt the Hereſies of the IV. and V. Century, which was the only matter in queſtion then.

It is worth our while to take notice of the ſingular Elogy he gives to St. *Ambroſe*, whom he calls *Veneranda Corona Chriſti Confeſſor Ambroſius Mediolanenſis Eccleſiæ Præſul.* 'The Venerable Crown of Chriſt, *Ambroſius* the Confeſſor, Biſhop of the Church of *Milan*. What I have here mentioned of *Manſuetus* is the more conſiderable, becauſe it was done by him preſiding in the Synod of his Dioceſs.

Laſtly, We may obſerve that the Deputies of *Manſuetus*, condemned *Honorius*, Biſhop of *Rome*, *Act.* 13. for being a *Monothelite*; and the matter at this time is no longer queſtioned, notwithſtanding *Baronius*, and ſome after him, have endeavoured to make it paſs for doubtful: whence it

appears that in *Italy* they held it for an inviolable Maxim:

First, That the Pope was liable to become an Heretick.

Secondly, That none were to continue in Communion with him, ſave only ſo far as he continued united to Jeſus Chriſt, as a true Believer; ſo far were they from ſuppoſing themſelves bound to cleave to the Church of *Rome*, as they would continue in the Communion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

But though we have but few particular Authors, that might inform us of the Opinions and Worſhip that took place in that Dioceſs; yet have we ſomething that ſeems more authentick. *viz.* The Liturgy which bears the name of St. *Ambroſe*. And foraſmuch as this piece was made uſe of before this Century, and that ſince that time it has ſerved for a Model of the Devotion of that Dioceſs, it will be of ſome importance carefully to examine the ſame, and the rather becauſe though I ſpeak of it only in this place; yet the Obſervations drawn from thence may and ought to be applied to the foregoing Ages, as well as thoſe that follow after.

CHAP. VII.

Some Reflections upon the Liturgy of this Dioceſs, called the Ambroſian *Liturgy.*

ONE of the moſt certain ways to be informed, concerning the Faith of a Church, is, to conſult her Liturgy. I am not ignorant that what *Joſephus Vicetomes* tells us, concerning the Antiquity of the *Ambroſian* Liturgy, *viz.* That St. *Barnabas* was the Author of it, that it was afterwards

afterwards augmented by *Merocles*; and lastly, having been revised by St. *Ambrose*, it obtained the name of *Ambrosian*, is absolutely false, and so ridiculous a conceit, that it is wholly rejected by Cardinal *Bona*. Neither am I ignorant that the Miracle related by *Durandus*, *Rational. Offic. L.* 5. *c.*2. as of the Life of St. *Eugenius*, concerning the *Ambrosian* Office, is just such another Story which deserves no manner of Credit, notwithstanding that *Ripomontius* has endeavoured to maintain it. But however we cannot deny the truth of what follows.

First, That this Liturgy has the Psalms, and divers other Texts of Scripture of the ancient Version called the *Italick*.

Secondly, That *Walafridus Strabo*, who lived in the midst of the Ninth Century, has cited this Liturgy under the name of the Liturgy of St. *Ambrose*. Indeed it seems very probable, that as several Centuries before the Ninth they had in divers Dioceses fixed a form of Divine Service, to be observed in the respective Churches of the same Dioceses; whereas before, *viz.* in the Fourth and Fifth Century every Bishop had the Liberty of prescribing the form himself; so that of *Milan*, conform'd to the same Rule, and the name of St. *Ambrose* was made use of by Posterity, as being so very famous, and because that St. *Ambrose* had probably dictated several of the Collects therein contained; Much in the same manner, as in the East, they have given the name of the Liturgy of St. *Basil* and St. *Chrysostom* to the Liturgies which were made use of in the Dioceses, where these great Men once flourished.

'Tis true, we have not this Liturgy now, preserved to us exactly as it was used in the Primitive Centuries: it has been variously changed by the rashness of those who succeeded those Primitive Authors, which has also happened to the greatest part of these works; as is acknowledged by Cardinal *Bona*, and *Mabillon*. It is likewise true, that since the Popes have been Sovereigns of the West, they have by themselves, or by their Creatures, brought in a vast number of variations, in the Books of the publick Offices which

which changes have been introduced with more eaſe, ſince the Latin began to be lookt upon as a Barbarous Language.

We have an illuſtrious proof hereof, in the *Ambroſian* Office, for *Good Friday*, where we find a Prayer for the Conſecrating of a Croſs, precedent to its Adoration. For it is certain that Pope *Adrian* the Firſt, who lived towards the end of the Eighth Century, declares that the Church did not conſecrate any Images: This being a practice that was introduced long after, and we find in the Life of St. *Lewis* a complaint of that Prince concerning this Subject; whence it appears that theſe Prayers muſt needs have been of a very late Date.

We have another example hereof, which cannot be diſputed; 'tis in the Canon, where we find at preſent theſe words, *pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt*: whereas thoſe words *pro quibus tibi offerimus* were foiſted in
P. 301. in the Thirteenth Century, as *Hugo Menardus* doth ingenuouſly acknowledge upon the Book of the Sacraments of St. *Gregory*. This Addition was made after that the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Maſs was received, and indeed it was altogether neceſſary, ſince without it, there could be no Oblation made by the Prieſt in that pretended Sacrifice, which was lookt upon as a Capital inconvenience.

A third proof hereof we have in the Feaſt of S. *Barnabas*, who is accounted the firſt Biſhop of *Milan*, and to whom they attribute the Curſing of the Heathen Temple at *Milan*, whereupon a part thereof fell down, and cruſhed ſeveral of the Idolaters under its ruines, which is a Story drawn from Legends of no ancient ſtanding.

But after all, it is eaſie to prove that this Liturgy was not at firſt tainted with any of thoſe Errors, wherewith it was filled in the following Ages, and in particular ſince the XII. Century, towards the end of which the Popes took care to change or abrogate all Liturgies whatſoever, that inſtead thereof that of *Rome* might be introduced, following therein the Spirit of Pope *Adrian*, who had begun this Work, being ſupported therein by the favour

of

of the Emperour *Charles* the Great, who first introduced this Spirit of change.

First of all then I maintain that this Liturgy had none of the *Confiteor* of the Priest, as we find it at this day in the Roman Missal, which *Confiteor* is at this day made to the Blessed Virgin, Angels and Saints, as well as to God. Now it is certain that this custom is only of late Ages; we have an undoubted proof hereof in the *Confiteor* set down by *Chrodegandus* Bishop of *Metz*, who lived in the time of *Pepin*, Father of *Charles* the Great. *Regula Canonicorum cap.* 18. *Ad primam Clero congregato donant confessiones, suas vicissim dicentes, confiteor Domino & tibi Frater quod peccavi.* 'At the first Canonical hour the Clergy being assembled, they make their mutual confessions, saying, 'I confess to the Lord, and thee my Brother, that I have 'sinned.

It is necessary to observe here,

1. That this Rule, for the most part of it, is borrowed from that of St. *Bennet*, who lived in the Popes Diocess.

2*ly*, That the same has been almost wholly transcribed in the Acts of the Council of *Aix la Chapelle*, in the Year 816.

3*ly*, That these Confessions to the Virgin, the Angels and Saints, are not found in any of the ancient forms of Confession, whereof we have a considerable number, which may be seen in the Notes of *Hugo Menardus* upon the Book of the Sacrament of St. *Gregory*, *pag.* 224. *& seq.*

Secondly, I maintain that there was nothing in this Liturgy, which imply'd any direct Invocation of the Saints, but only it supposeth that they intercede for the Church. We own, that since the Fourth Century, the Church has avowedly demanded several favours of God, by the intercession of Saints; but we do not find that they prayed directly to them. It is true there are several passages, in this Liturgy, wherein favours are begged of God *per preces & merita Sanctorum*, by the Prayers and Merits of the Saints. But the word *Merit*, then, contains nothing that can offend us, if we take it in the sense of the Primitive

Primitive Church, as ſignifying nothing elſe but godlineſs. There are a thouſand paſſages that prove this invincibly, as well in St. *Ambroſe*, as in thoſe Authors that have ſucceeded him: and in this Liturgy by *merit* and *to merit* the Church did not pretend to obtain by way of Juſtice, but only to obtain in general, as when we read in the Roman Office, *O Fœlix culpa quæ tantam meruit ſalutem!* O happy fault, which procured ſo great Salvation!

Thirdly, I maintain that we find therein no other Oblation of the Bread and Wine to God in the Action of the Sacrament, but the Oblation of the Bread and Wine to the Prieſt who officiated, which even to this day is yet practiſed by ſome Men and Women at *Milan*, according to the account given us thereof by Cardinal *Bona* and *Mabillon*; for otherwiſe this was abſolutely impoſſible, becauſe the expreſſion of *pro quibus offerimus*, *pag.* 301. made uſe of by the Prieſt to denote his action, was never put into the Roman Miſſal until the Thirteenth Century, as *Menardus*, a learned *Benedictine*, doth own. Secondly, Becauſe this notion of offering the Sacrament for a Propitiatory Sacrifice, is a thing even unknown to the moſt antient of the School-men, as our Divines have ſufficiently proved from their ſilence on that Queſtion. And certainly this is ſo ſtrange a notion, that in conſequence of it we muſt hold, That Jeſus Chriſt is ſacrificed and offered up to himſelf; for we find in the Prayers of St. *Anſelm*, falſely attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, theſe expreſſions, which are very ſingular, *pag.* 175. *Ut offeram tibi Sacrificium quod inſtituiſti, & offerri præcepiſti in commemorationem tui pro ſalute noſtra; ſuſcipe verò iſtud, quæſo, ſumme Deus, dilectiſſime Jeſu Chriſte pro Eccleſia tua ſancta.* 'That I may offer to thee the Sacrifice thou haſt inſtituted, and commanded to be offered in remembrance of thee, for our Salvation: Receive it, moſt high God, deareſt Jeſus Chriſt, we beſeech thee for thy Holy Church. It was neceſſary for them to change their words, after they had changed their Opinion. It was only the belief of Tranſubſtantiation, that made way for the belief of a Sacrifice properly ſo called, as the Church of *Rome* believes at this day; now it

is

is commonly enough known, that the *Romiſh* Church has hatch'd that Article her ſelf; and the Hiſtory of this change is ſo exactly ſet down, that it is needleſs to make any ſtop at it.

Fourthly, This Innovation can be demonſtratively proved, from this *Ambroſian* Liturgy alone. And not to mention now that it contain'd no office for the *Fridays* in *Lent*, which ſhews, that at that time they believed that the receiving of the Sacrament was a breaking of the Faſt, upon which account alſo they call it *Vitalia alimenta*, *Food of life*, and wholly overthrows the notion of Tranſubſtantiation.

We find there alſo this Prayer for the Poſt-Communion, *pag.* 310. *Pignus vitæ æternæ capientes, humiliter te Domine imploramus, ut apoſtolicis fulti Patrociniis, quod in imagine contigimus Sacramenti, manifeſtâ perceptione ſumamus.* 'Having 'received this pledge of eternal Life, we humbly beſeech 'thee, O Lord, that being aſſiſted with Apoſtolical Suffra-'ges, what we have now touched in the Image of the 'Sacrament, we may by manifeſt perception take and re-'ceive. This Prayer is found in the Miſſal of *Gelaſius*, and in other ancient Miſſals. Now, according to the obſervation of *Ratramnus*, that which is a Pledge and Image, is ſo of another thing different from it ſelf.

We find there the Communion under both kinds, *p.* 207. as well as the preſervation of thoſe two kinds, and their mixture, p. 304. in ſuch a manner, as quite overthrows the notion of Concomitance received in the Church of *Rome*.

We meet there alſo with this Prayer, *Hanc oblationem ſuſcipias in ſublimi altari tuo, per manus Angelorum tuorum, ſicut ſuſcipere dignatus es munera Pueri tui juſti* Abel, *&c.* 'Receive this Offering on thy high Altar, from the hands 'of thy Angels, as thou waſt pleaſed to receive the Gifts of 'thy Servant Righteous *Abel*, *pag.* 302, 303. Which Clauſes have made the Schoolmen to ſweat Blood and Water, in endeavouring to reconcile them with the notion of the Real Preſence.

We find there also this Prayer, which absolutely decides the question, *Æterne Deus suppliciter implorantes, ut filius tuus Jesus Christus, qui se in fine seculi suis promisit fidelibus affuturum, & præsentiæ corporalis Mysteriis, non deserat quos redemit, & majestatis suæ beneficiis non relinquat.* 'Beseeching 'thee, O eternal God, that thy Son Jesus Christ, who has 'promised to be with Believers to the end of the world, 'may not forsake those he has redeemed, with respect of 'the Mysteries; he may not deprive those whom he has 'redeemed, of the Mysteries of his Corporal Presence, nor 'leave them destitute of the Blessings of his Majesty. It seems evident, that these words, the Mysteries of his Bodily Presence, signifie plainly, that Jesus Christ is absent, with respect to his Flesh, though his body be present in its Image, which represents it to us.

Lib. 5. de Sacram. c. 5.

'Tis commonly supposed from the Testimony of the Books of the Sacraments, attributed to St. *Ambrose*, that the *Ambrosian* Liturgy had this Clause: *Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* 'Make this Offering to be imputed 'to us, reasonable and acceptable, which is a Figure of the 'Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And indeed, though the word *Figure* be not found now, in *Pamelius* his Edition of the *Ambrosian* Liturgy. Nevertheless, first, we find, that by a Marginal Note he refers his Reader to St. *Ambrose* himself, *de Sacram. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. Secondly, *Pamelius*, in his sixtieth Title, where he sets down the words of Consecration, cites the place of St. *Ambrose* with the word *figura*. Thirdly, We find it so in the Edition of St *Ambrose* printed at *Paris*, in the year 1529. the words are these: *Vis scire quia verbis cœlestibus consecratur, accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos, fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationabilem & acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* This passage has been corrupted in other Editions, but *Paschasius* his quoting of it in the year 835. in his Treatise of the Body and Blood of our Lord, confounds the Authors of this Falsification. But to speak the truth, as I do not believe,

lieve, that these Books of the Sacraments, were writ by St. *Ambrose*, though *Mabillan* assures us, that they have been found at St. *Gal*, under his name; so neither have I any certainty that this Prayer was taken out of the Office or Liturgy of St. *Ambrose*. What passages I have already cited, are sufficient to shew, that the Carnal Presence was not then believed by the Dioceſs of *Italy*. They who are willing to examine the said Liturgy, will find many other passages in it, that do invincibly confirm the same Truth.

By this we may judge what likelihood there is of finding any thing in this Liturgy, concerning the adoration of the Host after Consecration: Indeed, we are so far from finding any such thing there, that we meet with no hint thereof even in the Ages after *Paschasius*; of which we can give a demonstrative proof, *viz.* That whereas at this day use is made of the Adoration of the Host, to prove the Real Presence, none of those that disputed against *Berengarius* for almost 100 years together, did mention one word of that proof, which should clearly make out, That *Berengarius* and *Scotus* were Innovators, by opposing themselves to a belief; which serv'd for a Foundation to establish a Worship, which the Church had publickly own'd and practis'd.

I say nothing here concerning that clause made use of in the *Ambrosian* Liturgy, wherein they pray for the Dead, that *sleep the sleep of Peace*. Thus much is evident, That that Prayer is as contrary to the notion of Purgatory, as those we find in the *Roman Liturgy*, as our Authors and *Blondel* in particular have shewed. The *Prayer for the Dead, pag.* 298, which that *Liturgy* contains, was founded upon other Principles, than those which the Doctors of *Rome* at this day admit of; as hath been made out from the Confessions of the learned men of that Communion themselves. The substance of these Prayers is, that *Fidelibus vita mutatur, non tollitur, & in Temporis Dei observatione defunctis domicilium perpetuæ felicitatis acquiritur.* 'As to Believers, their life [by death] is only changed, not taken away, and that the deceased, who have lived in the observance of the Fear of God, do acquire

'a Manſion of perpetual Felicity: as we find the words in the Prayer for many Souls, *p.* 451. Not to inſiſt now, that in the next following Prayer the Boſome of *Abraham* is taken for the ſtate of Glory, which the Church of *Rome* contradicts and rejects at preſent.

I own, that in the *Ambroſian Liturgy*, *pag.* 341. we find the anointing of the Sick and poſſeſſed Perſons mention'd, but only with reference to the obtaining the Remiſſion of their Sins, and their Cure, which cannot be the *Roman* Unction. We find there this clauſe; *Concede infuſione Sancti ſpiritus, olim tibi placitam, præſentis olei confirmes, nobiliteſque ſubſtantiam, ut quicquid ex eo in humano genere tactum fuerit, ad naturam tranſeat mox ſupernam.* 'Grant by the Infuſion of 'the Holy Spirit, ſo to ſtrengthen and enrich the ſubſtance 'of this preſent Oil, formerly accepted of by thee, that 'whoſoever of the Race of Mankind ſhall therewith be 'touched, may immediately be exalted to the nature that is 'from on high.

What we meet with there likewiſe concerning the Conſecration of the Chriſm uſed in Confirmation, contains nothing that can give us much trouble. We acknowledge that it is a Ceremony which has been practis'd ſince the fourth Century, as an Appendix to Baptiſm; neither do we look upon that Ceremony as blame-worthy, but only ſo far as the Church of *Rome* has pretended to make a Sacrament of it, properly ſo called, and thereby to make a Ceremony, introduc'd by men, equal to that which was inſtituted by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf. And I have the ſame thing to ſay, concerning the Benediction of the Fire, and the Wax-Candles at *Eaſter*, the Benediction of the Fonts, and ſome other Ceremonies we meet with there.

Moreover, we find there, as well as in the *Roman* Liturgy, a Prayer wherein Remiſſion of Sins is beg'd of God, calling him *non æſtimator meriti, ſed veniæ donator*; *Not a regarder of Merit, but a giver of Pardon*: Which expreſſion one of the moſt famous Schoolmen has lookt upon as abſolutely contrary to the Doctrine of Merit, as it is held at preſent. So likewiſe, *pag.* 298. we find theſe words, *Iniquitates meas*

ne

ne respexeris, sed sola tua misericordia mihi prosit indigno. 'Do 'not thou regard mine Iniquities, but let thy alone mercy 'help me unworthy.

After all, we must continually remember, that this Piece comes from very suspected hands; *Pamelius*, who is the first that has printed it, confesseth himself to have cut off a great part of it, which he pretends *indeed* to have done only to avoid Repetition: But, it is well known, that these sort of Works must be very exactly inspected, to be well assured of the force of the expressions therein contained, and to be able to pass a certain Judgment concerning them. I return now to the method I have prescrib'd to my self.

CHAP. VIII.

Opinions of the Churches of Italy, *during the Eighth Century.*

WE may be informed concerning the state of these Churches, first, by the Council of *Forojulio*, wherein no other Creed is prescribed to the People, but that of the Apostles, nor any other Prayer, but the Lord's Prayer; by which, in abstaining from wicked Works, men may certainly arrive at Salvation. Secondly, By their Bishops assisting at the Council of *Francfort*, in the year 794. which was a Synod of the Western Church. *Paulinus* Bishop of *Aquileia*, who was present there, wrote at the same time a Book against the Doctrine of *Felix* Bishop of *Urgel*, and *Elipandus* Bishop of *Toledo*, who maintained the Opinions of *Nestorius*. It appears, that he wrote this Book by the order of *Charles* the Great, during the Session of that Council. He plainly asserts in this writing, *First*, That the Bishops were conven'd there by the orders of *Charles* the Great; he knew not that it belonged to the Pope alone to regulate matters

T. 7. Concil. p. 1002.

p. 315.

matters of Faith, and assemble Councils: *Secondly*, That what he attributes to the Church, that She cannot be overcome by Heresies, which are the Gates of Hell, has reference only to the Universal Church, very far from attributing this Priviledge to the Popes, as being the Successors of St. *Peter*. *Thirdly*, That this Council did not expect their Authority from the Pope's Confirmation, since they maintain, That *Felix* and *Elipandus* ought to be excommunicated *post plenaria Synodi judicium*; upon Judgment past by a full Council.

p. p. 316. & 319.

I acknowledge, that he seems to give great deference to the Authority of Pope *Adrian*, when he saith, That the followers of *Felix* and *Elipandus* ought to be excommunicated with their Masters, *Reservato per omnia Juris Privilegio summi Pontificis Domini & Patris nostri, Adriani, primæ sedis Beatissimi Papæ*: 'The rightful Priviledges of the High Priest 'our Lord and Father *Adrian*, the most blessed Pope of 'the principal See, being alwaies reserv'd intire. But it is plain, that he makes use of this Condescention for no other reason, but because *Charles* the Great had desired him to consult Pope *Adrian* upon so important a question; though indeed the Excommunication being already pronounced, this, after all, could be nothing more than a Ceremony, or at the most a wise Precaution, to hinder the Pope from engaging himself with a bad party.

We have a certain proof hereof from the manner how *Paulinus* and the Bishops of *Italy* did agree to condemn the Definitions of the Second Council of *Nice*, in the year 787, as Idolatrous Definitions, notwithstanding that Pope *Adrian* had assisted at that Council by his Legates, and though he did his utmost endeavours to maintain them. All Authors of the IX. Century, and next following, do unanimously testifie, That the Council of *Francfort*, where *Paulinus* and his fellow-Deputies of the Dioceſs of *Italy* were present, did condemn the Second Council of *Nice*, notwithstanding that *Theophylact* and *Stephen* the Pope's Legates assisted at it. We may easily conceive from hence, what was the Judgment of the Bishops of *Italy*, with reference to the Pope, and

those

those that joined with him: If they held any Communion with the Pope, they did it only with design to bring him back again to the Truth; so that they acted conformably to the Opinion of the Bishops of *France*, which is expreſt by *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, upon the same occasion, *lib.* 1. *pag.* 539, & 540. notwithstanding *Jonas* pronounceth *Anathema* against those that Worship Images.

I shall say nothing concerning the Exhortation which St. *Paulinus* addresseth to the Bishops, towards the end of his Book, that they would pray to God, by the intercession of the Holy Virgin and St. *Peter*, the first Pastor of the Church, and of all Saints, and by the Suffrages of the Council, to defend the Emperour; for we find after all, that this is only a wish founded on this Supposal, That Saints, after death, may pray for the welfare of the Living, which seems probable enough.

We find also what was the Doctrine of *Paulinus* Bishop of *Aquileia*, in the Book he wrote against *Felix* Bishop of *Urgel*, at the request of *Charles* the Great. See how he expresseth himself concerning the Eucharist, in his Dedication to *Charles* the Great, *pag.* 1766. *&c. initio.* He affirms, That the Eucharist consists of Bread: he calls it, *Buccella & particula panis*, a morsel and bit of Bread: He maintains, That it is either Death or Life in the Mouth of him that eats it; according as he hath or hath not Faith: Than which, nothing could be spoke more clear, to prove, that the Eucharist is nothing but Bread and Substance, and that Faith or Incredulity makes all the difference that is found amongst Communicants.

He referrs and applies the Character of *Priest*, according to the Order of *Melchizedeck*, to the Incarnation and Cross of Jesus Christ, and not to the Sacrifice of the Mass. He thunders out *Anathema's* against all humane Satisfactions, maintaining, That the Blood of none of those that have been redeem'd themselves, is capable to blot out the least Sin, and that that is the Priviledge of our Saviour Jesus Christ alone, *pag.* 1792.

He

He lays it down as a Rule, that the humane nature in Chriſt is ſo circumſcribed, as to be only in one place, *pag.* 1833. *Natura namque altera, hoc eſt hominis, erat in terra tantummodo; altera ubique in Cœlo & in terra, hoc eſt divina. Potuit ergo quod duo erant, divinum ſc. & humanum aliud in Cœlo & ubique eſſe, & aliud in terra ſolummodo. Non tamen potuit ille qui unus erat, filius videlicet Dei & hominis, non totus ubiq; eſſe, in Cœlo pariter & in terra. Ubiq; ſanè totus quia unus eſt & omnipotens Deus; unus idemq; omnipotentis Dei, & hominis filius. Humana namq; natura non deſcendit, nec fuit ibi priuſquam, in Deum aſſumpta, aſcenderet corporaliter in Cœlum. Filius autem hominis quia unus idemq; ipſe eſt filius Dei, & de Cœlo deſcendit, unde nunquam diſceſſerat, & in Cœlo erat, cum loqueretur in terra; & in terram venit ubi erat, & in Cœlum aſcenſurus erat per id quod homo eſt, & ibi aſcendit ubi erat prius, per id quod Deus eſt. Domini namq; ſunt verba dicentis; Nemo aſcendit in Cœlum, niſi qui deſcendit de Cœlo, filius hominis qui eſt in Cœlo.* 'One of his natures, the humane, was only upon Earth: 'the other, that is, the Divine Nature, was every where, 'both in Heaven and on Earth: wherefore, becauſe theſe 'were two natures, *viz.* the Divine and Humane, the one 'of them could be in Heaven, and every where, and the other 'only on Earth. Yet notwithſtanding, he who was the only 'Son both of God and Man, could not but be wholly every 'where, both in Heaven and on Earth; whole every where, 'becauſe he is the One, and omnipotent God; one and God 'Almighty, and the one Son of Almighty God and Man. 'For the Humane Nature did not come down from Hea'ven, neither was it there, till being taken up to God, it 'aſcended corporally into Heaven. And becauſe the Son 'of Man is one and the ſame with the Son of God, 'therefore he came down from Heaven, from whence he 'never departed, and was in Heaven while he ſpoke here 'upon Earth; and he came down to the Earth, where he 'was before, and was to aſcend into Heaven, as he was 'Man, and as he was God, he aſcended where he was be'fore; for they are the words of our Lord; No Man 'aſcends up into Heaven, but he that came down from 'Hea-

'Heaven, even the Son of Man, who is in Heaven. Which is the ſame opinion we find expreſt in the Council of *Forojulio*, in the year 791. in which *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Aquileia* preſided. *T. 7. Conc. p.* 1001.

He aſſerts, that in celebrating the Euchariſt, we feed upon the Divine Nature of Jeſus Chriſt, which cannot be ſaid, but only with reſpect to Believers, and muſt be underſtood metaphorically; which plainly ſhews what his Belief was concerning the Oral Manducation of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, *pag.* 1836. *Vel quâ ratione ſi adoptivus filius eſt, qui non manducat Carnem filii hominis, & non bibit ejus ſanguinem, non habet vitam æternam? Qui manducat*, inquit, *meam Carnem, & bibit meum ſanguinem habet vitam æternam, & ego reſuſcitabo eum in noviſſimo die. Caro mea verè eſt cibus, & ſanguis meus verè eſt potus. Reſuſcitandi in noviſſimo die poteſtas, nulli alio niſi verò permanet Deo. Caro namque & ſanguis ad humanam, per quam filius hominis eſt, non ad divinam referri poteſt naturam. Et tamen ſi ille filius hominis cui hæc Caro & ſanguis eſt, pro eo quod unus idemq; ſit Dei & hominis filius, ſi Deus verus non eſſet, caro ejus & ſanguis manducantibus & bibentibus ſe, nullo modo vitam præſtaret æternam. Unde & Johannes Evangeliſta ait, & ſanguis filii ejus lavat nos ab omni peccato. Aut cujus caro & ſanguis dat vitam manducantibus & bibentibus ſe, niſi filii hominis, quem Deus ſignavit Pater, qui eſt verus & omnipotens Filius Dei. Nam & panis vivus pro nobis deſcendit de Cœlo, qui dat vitam mundo; quiq; ex eo manducaverit non moritur in æternum: ipſe enim dicit, Ego ſum panis vivus qui de Cœlo deſcendi. Sic quippe deſcendit panis vivus de Cœlo, qui ſemper manebat in Cœlo, ſicut filius hominis deſcendit de Cœlo, qui quoniam unus idemq; erat Filius Dei, nunquam deſeruit Cœlum.* 'Or, How if he be an adopted 'Son only? Is it ſaid, that he who doth not eat the Fleſh 'of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, hath not eter-'nal Life? He that eats, ſaith he, my Fleſh, and drinks my 'Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raiſe him up at the 'laſt day. My Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is 'Drink indeed. The power of raiſing up at the laſt day 'belongs to none, but the true God; for the Fleſh and

'Blood cannot be referred to his divine, but to his hu-
'mane Nature, by which he is the Son of Man: And
'yet if that Son of Man, whose this Flesh and Blood is,
'(for that one and the same person is both the Son of
'God, and the Son of Man) were not true God, his Flesh
'and Blood could not procure eternal Life to those that
'eat them. And therefore *John* the Evangelist saith, and
'the blood of his Son cleanseth us from all Sin. Or,
'whose Flesh and Blood gives life to those that eat and drink
'them, but the Son of Man's whom God the Father hath
'sealed, who is the true and Almighty Son of God; for
'*He*, the Bread of Life, is come down from Heaven for
'us, who gives life unto the World, and whosoever eats
'thereof shall live for ever: for he himself saith, I am
'the Bread of Life that came down from Heaven: for
'this Bread of Life came down from Heaven, which al-
'so alwaies staid in Heaven, in the same manner as the
'Son of Man came down from Heaven, who because he
'is also the Son of God, never left Heaven.

We cannot meet with a more Orthodox Explication of the Office of Mediator and Advocate, than that is which he sets down, or a greater precaution than he gives us, not to look upon the Saints as Mediators, *pag.* 1790. *Mediator igitur ab eo quod medius sit intra utrasq; dissidentium partes, & reconciliet ambos in unum, &c. Deniq; non Paulus Mediator, sed Legatus fidelis mediatoris; legationem, inquit, fungimur pro Christo, reconciliamini Deo. Advocatus namq; est, qui jam pro reconciliatis interpellat, quemadmodum idem redemptor noster facit, cum humanam Deo patri, in unitate Dei, hominisq; personæ, naturam ostendit. Hoc est enim Deum patrem pro nobis interpellare. Joannes non interpellare, sed ipsum etiam esse propitiationem pro peccatis nostris declarat.* 'Wherefore he is called the Me-
'diator, because he is a middle person between both the
'disagreeing Parties, and reconciles them together in one, &c.
'Lastly, *Paul* is not a Mediator, but a faithful Ambassador
'of the Mediator. We are Ambassadors for Christ, *and*
'*the Sum of our Embassy* is, Be ye reconciled to God. An Advo-
'cate is one that intercedes for those that are already re-
'conciled,

'conciled, even as our Redeemer doth, when he ſhews his 'humane Nature to God the Father, in the Unity of his 'Perſon, who is God man; for this is truly to intercede with 'God the Father for us. *John* doth not ſay that he intercedes 'for us, but declares him to be a propitiation for our 'Sins.

He clearly ſhews in the ſame place, pag 1792. that he did not look upon the Saints as Redeemers, but Jeſus Chriſt alone, according to the ſignification of his name; ſince none of them, who have been redeemed themſelves, are able to blot out Sin. *Etenim omnipotentis Dei filius, omnipotens Dominus noſter, quia pretio ſanguinis ſui nos redemit, jure redemptor, verus omnium redemptorum vocibus prædicatur, non inquam ille redemptus, quia nunquam captivus; nos vero redempti, quia fuimus captivi, renundati ſub peccato, obligati nimirum in eo Chirographo decreti, quod ipſe tulit de medio, delens ſanguine ſuo, quod nullius alius redemptorum delere potuit ſanguis adfixit illud, palam triumphans in ſemetipſo.* 'For the Son of the Almighty God, 'our Almighty Lord, becauſe he has redeemed us with the 'price of his Blood, is juſtly called the true Redeemer, by all 'that are redeemed by him. He, I ſay, was not redeemed, 'becauſe he was never captive; but we are redeemed, who 'were Captives, ſold under Sin, and bound by the hand-'writing that was againſt us, which he took away, blot-'ting it out with his Blood, which the Blood of no other 'Redeemer could do, and fixed it to his Croſs, openly trium-'phing over it in himſelf.

It plainly appears, that he had no other notion concerning the obſcurity of Scripture, than we have, by his approaching *Fœlix*, that he had done according to St. *Peter*'s Diſcourſe concerning the Writings of St. *Paul*, pag. 1795, & 1796.

He doth not own, that the Church was founded on St. *Peter*, but on Jeſus Chriſt, pag. 1800, & 1801. *Et licet eſſet primus in ordine Apoſtolorum, ideo tamen diu ſiluit, quia non Dominus quid illi, pro quibus ſolus Petrus reſponſurus erat, ſed quid homines de filio hominis æſtimarent, explorare dignatus eſt.* 'And 'though he were the firſt amongſt the Apoſtles, yet he did not

'ſpeak for ſome time, becauſe the Lord did not enquire 'what they, for whom only *Peter* was to anſwer, but what 'men thought of the Son of Man.

He lays it down as an inviolable Maxim of Chriſtianity, that we cannot believe but in God only, in oppoſition to that which is taught by the Church of *Rome*.

He wholly overthrows the immaculate Conception of the Bleſſed Virgin, *pag.* 1808, *ad finem. Ipſe quippe ſolus & ſingulariter de Spiritu ſancto conceptus, & natus ex Virgine, à vulva ſine peccato prodiit Deus & homo.* 'For he alone being in a 'ſingular manner, conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, and born 'of the Virgin, came forth from the Womb without Sin, 'both God and Man.

If any one will take the pains to examine the Opinions of this Biſhop, he will find it an hard thing not to take notice that he denies what the Church of *Rome* affirms, with relation to all theſe Articles; and that he affirms what the Church of *Rome* denies, and whatever colourable Arts may be employed, it will be very hard not to perceive this oppoſition through them all.

I join with St. *Paulinus* of *Aquileia*, *Paulus Diaconus* of the ſame Church, who, foraſmuch as he was very famous towards the end of the Eighth, and about the beginning of the Ninth Century, we have reaſon not to paſs over his Opinions without ſome notice taken of them; and the rather doth his Judgment deſerve a more particular conſideration, becauſe he was born in *Lombardy*, was Deacon of the Church of *Aquileia*, whence he was removed by *Charles* the Great, after his having taken *Deſiderius*, the laſt King of the *Lombards*, Priſoner, and was honoured with the Favour of *Charles* the Great. We have ſeveral of his Pieces, but I ſhall content my ſelf with two of his Treatiſes, the one whereof is the Life of St. *Gregory* the Great, becauſe the Papiſts believe they have found in that Book an invincible proof for Tranſubſtantiation; the other is, the Collection of *Homilies* he made for all the Feſtival daies of the year, by the order of *Charles* the Great, and which that Emperor authorized by his approbation.

He

He tells us, in the Life of St. *Gregory*, That a *Roman* Lady, who was us'd to make the Bread her ſelf, which ſhe offer'd for the Communion, ſmiling when St. *Gregory* offer'd a piece of it to her in the Euchariſt, St. *Gregory* perceiving it, took back the piece of Bread, and gave it to the Deacon, to keep it till the Communion was over, at which time he demanded of her why ſhe had laughed; to which ſhe anſwered, That it was becauſe he called that the Body of our Lord, which ſhe knew to be a piece of the ſame Bread ſhe had offered. Whereupon St. *Gregory* made a Sermon to the People, exhorting them to beg of God, that he would be pleaſed to manifeſt that to them, which that unbelieving Woman could not ſee with the Eyes of Faith. After Prayer, he draws near to the Altar, lifts up the corporal Pall that covered the piece of Bread, and ſhews them the top of his little finger ſtain'd with Blood, [*Ac mulieri dixit, diſce, inquam, veritati vel modo jam credere conteſtanti, panis quem ego do, caro mea eſt, & ſanguis meus verè eſt potus. Sed præſcius conditor noſter infirmitatis noſtræ, eâ poteſtate, quâ cuncta fecit ex nihilo, & corpus ſibi ex carne ſemper virginis, operante ſancto ſpiritu fabricavit, panem & vinum aquâ mixtum, manente propria ſpecie in carnem & ſanguinem ſuum, ad Catholicam precem, ob reparationem noſtram, ſpiritus ſancti ſanctificatione convertit:*] 'and ſaid to the Woman; Learn, I ſay, 'from henceforward at leaſt to believe Truth it ſelf, which 'ſaith, *The bread which I give is my fleſh, and my blood is drink indeed.* 'But our Creator foreſeeing our weakneſs, by the ſame power 'by which he made the World of nothing, and made 'himſelf a Body; by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt, 'of the Fleſh of the ever Virgin, has by the Sanctifica-'tion of the holy Spirit, converted the Bread and Wine 'mix'd with Water, ſtill remaining under their own kind, 'into his Fleſh and Blood, at the Catholick Prayer, for 'our Salvation. This done, he commanded all the People to beg of God, *ut in formam priſtinam ſacroſanctum reformaret myſterium, quatenus mulieri ad ſumendum fuiſſet poſſibile*; 'that he would change that holy Myſtery into the form it 'had before, ſo as the Woman might be able to take it;

'which

'which happening accordingly, ſtrengthened the Faith of 'that Lady, and of all the People that were preſent.

I ſhall not examine at preſent, whether this Hiſtory be a Fable or not; ſure it is, that moſt of the particulars it contains ſeem to be of that character, or at leaſt we find none there, whoſe truth is atteſted by witneſſes that lived at the time of St. *Gregory*, or ſoon after. But let this be as it will, I deny that theſe Miracles, whereof we have ſome other inſtances in the Book entituled *Vitæ Patrum*, can be of any uſe to confirm the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; as *Mabillon* pretends in the Margin of this Relation, and that conſequently *Paulus Diaconus*, who relates the ſame, did not believe Tranſubſtantiation.

Firſt, I deny that by the word *Species*, ever any one ſpeaking of Bread, underſtood any other thing than the Subſtance of Bread. Let them prove to us, that the word *Species* did ever heretofore ſignifie the Accidents only; this being a notion which Tranſubſtantiation gave birth to ſome Ages after that wherein *Paulus Diaconus* lived.

Secondly, I deny that from this Apparition we can inferr the Real Preſence; we may indeed from thence conclude a Virtual Preſence, but nothing more. The conſequence is ſo clear, that it hath been acknowledged by the Schoolmen, whilſt they were enquiring what might be concluded from theſe kind of Apparitions, of the Fleſh of a Child, of Blood in the Euchariſt. And indeed, if any ſuch thing were to be inferred from theſe Apparitions, we ought alſo to conclude the contrary; for, there have been Miracles quite oppoſite to theſe now related; I'll inſtance in a very notable one: A *Severian Heretick* having lockt up the Euchariſt, that his Servant, who was a Catholick, had put in his Trunk, as *Moſchus* tells us, *c.* 79. he found Ears of Corn in the ſtead of it: Was the Subſtance of Bread here return'd again, and did it afterwards bring forth Ears of Corn? Thoſe of the *Romiſh* Church are very far from believing any ſuch thing. We read alſo in the Life of *Melanius* Biſhop of *Rhennes*, that the Euchariſt was changed into a Serpent, to puniſh the Superſtition of *Marſus*, who

who had preferr'd the keeping of a Faſt, to the receiving of the Communion, and that afterwards the ſaid Serpent was changed into the Euchariſt again at the Prayer of *Millanius*, and was then received by *Marſus*.

Beſides, *Paulus Diaconus* himſelf ſhews us in his following Relation, what he would have us to conclude from this ſort of Miracles. He tells us, That a great Lord having ſent his Ambaſſadors to *Rome*, to obtain ſome Relicks of the Apoſtles and Martyrs, that St. *Gregory*, inſtead of the Relicks they deſired, gave them only ſome pieces of conſecrated Cloth, which he ſeverally put up into Boxes, and deliver'd them unto the Ambaſſadors, having firſt ſealed the Boxes with his own Seal. And adds, That the Ambaſſadors being ſeiz'd with a curioſity, on their journey homeward, to know what thoſe Boxes contain'd, they had been ſtrangely ſurpriſed upon opening of them, to find nothing there but ſome ſcraps of Cloth, which made them return back to *Rome* to make their complaint, that inſtead of the Bones of Martyrs or Apoſtles, they had given them nothing but ſome bits of Cloth. Upon theſe complaints made by the Ambaſſadors to the Archdeacon; St. *Gregory* commandeth them to come to Church, and exhorted the People to pray to God; *Quatenus in hac re dignetur apertiſſimè ſic ſuam potentiam patefacere, ut quid mereatur fides, evidentius minus credulis & ignorantes poſſint cognoſcere. Et data oratione accepit cultellum qui temeraverat ſigna, & ſuper altare corporis ſancti Petri, acceptam unam panni portionem per medium pungens ſecuit, ex qua ſtatim ſanguis decurrit, & omnem eandem portiunculam cruentavit. Videntes autem ſupraſcripti Legatarii, & omnes populi ſtupendum & arcanum fidei ſacræ miraculum, ceciderunt proni in terram, adorantes Dominum dicentes; Mirabilis Deus in ſanctis ſuis, Deus Iſrael, ipſe dabit virtutem & fortitudinem plebi ſuæ, benedictus Deus. Et facta ſilentio, inter alia fidei documenta, dixit ad eos Beatus* Gregorius, *qui ante has venerandas reliquias parvi duxerant: Scitote, fratres, quia in conſecratione corporis & ſanguinis Domini noſtri Jeſu, cum ob ſanctificationem reliquiarum in honore Apoſtolorum vel martyrum ipſius quibus ſpecialiter aſſignabantur, ſupra ſacroſanctum*

ctum altare libamina offerebantur, semper illorum sanguis hos pannos intravit qui effusus est pro nomine Christi Domini nostri. 'That he would be pleased so openly to declare his power on this occasion, that the Unbelievers and the Ignorant might know what Faith is able to effect. And 'Prayer being ended, he took the knife wherewith the Seals 'had been broke open, and laying one of those pieces of 'Cloth upon the Holy Altar of St. *Peter*, he struck the 'Knife through it, from whence immediately Blood gushed 'forth, which stained the whole piece of Cloth; whereupon the Ambassadors and all the People beholding 'this astonishing and mysterious Miracle of Holy Faith, 'fell flat down with their Faces to the Ground, and worshipped the Lord, saying, Wonderful is the Lord in his 'Saints, the God of *Israel*, he shall give Virtue and Strength 'to his People, blessed be God. And after silence was 'made, amongst other instructions in the Faith, St. *Gregory* said unto them, who before had undervalued these 'venerable Relicks, Know ye Brethren, that in consecrating the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, when 'for the sanctification of Relicks in honour of the Apostles or Martyrs, whose they were, Drink-offerings were 'offered on the holy Altar, their Blood, which was shed 'for the Name of Jesus Christ, alwaies entered these 'pieces of Cloth. This is that they call *Brandeum*, mentioned by *Sigebert*, upon the year 441, when he says, that St. *Leo* had brought it into request. True it is, that this Fable is of a sort unknown to all Antiquity; but however it proves thus much, That these Apparitions of Blood in the Host, suppose no more than the virtue of the Blood of Jesus Christ.

As to the Homilies of the Primitive Fathers, whereof *Paulus Diaconus* made a Collection, 'tis very surprizing to find not so much as one inserted amongst them, whence we can pick this Doctrine of the Real Presence, if he with the Church of his time had conceiv'd this to have been the Doctrine of the Primitive Church. We find indeed in this his Collection some Homilies of St. *Leo*, *Feria* 2, 3, 4. and some others,

others, which treat of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ substituted instead of the Passover: But we find this matter so dryly handled in them, that it is hard to conceive how these Expressions of Antiquity could satisfie a man, who had been ting'd with the Doctrine of *Paschasius*.

As for those other *Romish* Doctrines, which at this day are made the leading points of Religion, we may boldly say, that we can find nothing of them in this Collection of Homilies, amongst which there are many of St. *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan*, and *Maximus* Bishop of *Turin*, whose Belief we have already given a sufficient account of; the rest of this Collection consists for the most part of the Homilies of *Origen*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Austin*, St. *Chrysostom*, and venerable *Bede*, whose Opinions are well known, there being scarce any of these Authors, whose Belief has not been represented in particular, to make it appear how far they were from concurring with the Opinions of the Church of *Rome*, about the principal Doctrines, which at this day are the causes of the Separation of the Protestants from that Church.

CHAP. IX.

Opinions of the Church of Italy *during the Ninth Century.*

WE are now come to the Ninth Century, wherein after this Diocess had been subject to several Princes, it came into the hands of *Charles* the Great and his Successors. We have already seen how the Prelates of this Diocess, at the Council of *Francfort*, oppos'd themselves to Superstition, which then began to gather strength. But we shall perceive this more clearly in the sequel of

this Diſcourſe. It cannot be denied, but that the ſtate of the Church in general was, as it were, wholly overthrown. *Angilbertus* Biſhop of *Milan*, gives us a moſt ſad repreſentation of it, in the relation which he gives to *Ludovicus Pius*. 'To our great ſorrow, ſaith he, we have found, that 'ſcarce ought of Holineſs or Sincerity is left in the Church, 'and the Corruptions are crept into it; which afterwards he inſtanceth in particular: and I doubt not but *Italy* had her ſhare of the Infection. Indeed Superſtition could not but encreaſe under the ſhelter of ſo profound a negligence of the Paſtors, as did then obtain: but the Divine Providence was pleaſed to provide a Remedy againſt it by means of *Claudius* Biſhop of *Turin*. And ſince *Claudius* had a great ſhare in defending of the Truth, in this Dioceſs of *Italy*, where God had placed him, and that by this means he has been extreamly expoſed to the Calumnies of the Romiſh Party; it will be very well worth our pains, to repreſent here theſe three things, his Character, his Writings, and his Opinions.

Ripamont. in his Hiſt.

This *Claudius* was born in *Spain*, he had been a Diſciple of *Fœlix* Biſhop of *Urgel*; he was for ſome years in the Court of *Ludovicus Pius* amongſt his Chaplains; and being endowed with great Talents for a Preacher, when *Lewis* being advanced to the Empire, he cauſed him to be ordained Biſhop of *Turin*. It will probably be imagined that he had borrowed from *Fœlix* Biſhop of *Urgel*, the Companion of *Elipandus*, the Opinions of *Neſtorianiſm*: but whoſoever thinks ſo, will find himſelf miſtaken; for his Character of a great Preacher, which had procured him the Eſteem of the Emperor, and his long continuance in *Lewis*'s Court, during the Life of *Charles* the Great, a Court where that Opinion, ſince the condemnation of *Fœlix* and *Elipandus*, at *Franckfort*, in 794, was very much had in deteſtation, are ſufficient to purge him from any ſuch Suſpicion. But over and above all this, his Writings upon the Scripture, ſhew him to have been very far from that Opinion; for we find in ſeveral paſſages unqueſtionable Evidences of his Orthodox Judgment in this point. What he ſaith upon the 25 of St. *Mat-*

St. *Matthew* ver. 31. is decisive in this matter, and yet he expresseth himself more strongly, if it be possible, on *Matt.* ch. 22. ver. 2. Neither is it less easie to purge him of another Calumny, which was cast upon him after his death, by *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, who in his Preface to King *Charles* the Bald, accuseth him for having endeavoured to revive the Sect of *Arius*. I thought, at first, that this was only a fault of the Transcriber, who had writ *Arius* for *Aerius*; but the manner of *Jonas*'s expressing himself has made me retract my first conjecture: however, it is no less easie to refute this Calumny, than it was to clear him from the first Suspicion. In a word, we do not find any thing like it in so many Books writ by him, and we find that which is contrary to it on *Mat.* 12. *ver.* 25. Let them make out to us, that any such thing was found amongst his Papers after his death, as *Jonas* seems to insinuate, and we shall believe, that *Jonas* was not over apt to give credit to those men, whose only aim was, to bespatter the Reputation of *Claudius*, and to make it odious and detestable to Posterity, because he cried down their Superstition and Idolatry. Except they perform this, we must still look upon this accusation as a meer Calumny.

As for the Works of this Great Man, we may affirm, there were few in his time who took so much pains to explain the Scripture, or to oppose themselves against the Torrent of Superstition.

He wrote three Books upon *Genesis*, in the year 815. He made a Commentary on St. *Matthew*, which he published the same year, dedicating it to *Justus* Abbot of *Charroux*.

He published a Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Galatians*, in the year 816, and dedicated it to *Drutteramnus* a famous Abbot, who had exhorted him to write Comments upon all St. *Paul*'s Epistles.

He wrote a Commentary on the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, which he dedicated to *Ludovicus Pius*, who commanded him to comment upon St. *Paul*'s Epistles, which dedicatory Epistle of his has been published by *Mabillon*.

He made a Commentary upon *Exodus*, in four Books, which he publiſhed in the year 821, dedicating them to the Abbot *Theodemirus*.

He made alſo another on *Leviticus*, which he publiſhed in the year 823, and dedicated it to the ſame Abbot. *Oudin* tells us, he hath ſeen a Commentary of his on the Book of *Ruth*, in a Library in *Hainault*.

Of all theſe his Works, there is nothing printed but his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*. The *Monks* of St. *Germain* have his Commentary upon all the Epiſtles in MS. in two Volumes, which were found in the Library of the Abby of *Fleury*, near *Orleans*. They have alſo his MS. Commentaries on *Leviticus*, which formerly belonged to the Library of St. *Remy* at *Rheims*. As for his Commentary on St. *Matthew*, there are ſeveral MS. Copies of it in *England*, as well as elſewhere.

We may judge in what credit and eſteem the Doctrine of *Claudius* was at that time, by the earneſtneſs wherewith the Emperor *Ludovicus Pius*, and the moſt famous Abbots of thoſe times, preſſed him to explain the Holy Scripture in his Writings. We may alſo conclude the ſame from his being promoted to the Epiſcopal Dignity in a place, where the Superſtition in reference to Images obliged the Emperor to provide them with a Biſhop that was both learned and vigorous; for *Jonas* of *Orleans* cannot diſſemble, but that it was upon this very conſideration, That the Emperor made a particular choice of *Claudius* to be conſecrated Biſhop of *Turin*. Moreover, this See was not an ordinary Biſhoprick, but a very conſiderable Metropolis in the Dioceſs of *Italy*; but it was not till ſome time after that the Title of Archbiſhops was beſtowed upon Metropolitans.

The time wherein he was advanced to the Epiſcopal Dignity, is not certainly known. *Father le Cointe* conjectures very probably, that it was in the year 817. But whether that be ſo or no, ſure it is, that *Claudius* in his Illuſtration of the Scripture plainly ſhewed himſelf to be very free from thoſe Errors which at this day are in vogue in Romiſh Communion.

We

We need only read his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, to aſſure us, that he every where aſſerts the equality of all the Apoſtles with St. *Peter*, though the occaſions ſeem'd naturally to engage him to eſtabliſh the Primacy of St. *Peter*, and that of his pretended Succeſſors. This we find in ten ſeveral paſſages of that Commentary; he only declares the Primacy of St. *Peter* to conſiſt in the honour he had of founding the Church both amongſt the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, p. 810. And indeed every where throughout his Writings he maintains, That Jeſus Chriſt is the only Head of the Church. *B. Pædit. Pariſ. T. 1. p. 789, 800, 801, 803, 805, 806, 807, 809, 810, 814.*

He overthrows the Doctrine of Merits in ſuch a manner as overthrows all the nice Diſtinctions of the Papiſts on that ſubject.

He pronounces *Anathema*'s againſt Traditions in matter of Religion, ſo far was he from giving occaſion to others to ſuſpect, that he made them a part of the Object of his Faith, as the Church of *Rome* at preſent doth.

He maintains, That Faith alone ſaves us, which is the point that ſo extreamly provoked the Church of *Rome* againſt *Luther*, who aſſerted the ſame thing. Ib. p. 823.

He holds the Church to be ſubject to Error, oppoſite to what at this day the Romaniſts pretend in ſo unreaſonable a manner. Ib. p. 829.

He denies, That Prayers after Death may be of any uſe to thoſe that have demanded them. Ib. p. 844.

He very ſmartly laſht the Superſtition and Idolatry, which then began to be renewed, being ſupported by the Authority of the Roman See. p. 842.

Theſe things we find in his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; but the other Writings of this great man, Manuſcript and Printed, ſhew us yet more of his mind. Indeed, we find him giving very publick marks of his Zeal for the Purity of Religion in ſeveral points. Firſt, he propoſeth the Doctrine of the Church, in reference to the Euchariſt, in a manner altogether conformable to the Judgment of Antiquity, following therein the moſt illuſtrious Doctors of the Chriſtian Church, and ſhewing that he was, as to that matter, at the fartheſt diſtance from the Opinions which

which *Paſchaſius Radbertus* advanced eighteen or nineteen years after that *Claudius* had writ his Commentary upon St. *Matthew*. *Claudius*'s own words, as they were taken from a MS. of *M. Theyer*, are theſe:

Lib. 3. cap. 14.

Cœnantibus autem eis, accepit Jeſus panem & benedixit ac fregit, deditq; diſcipulis ſuis, & ait, Accipite & Comedite, hoc eſt corpus meum. Finitis paſchæ veteris ſolenniis quæ in commemorationem antiquæ de Ægypto liberationis populi Dei agebantur; tranſiit ad novum, quod in ſuæ redemptionis memoriam Eccleſiam frequentare volebat: Ut videlicet & pro carne agni ac ſanguine ſui corporis ſanguiniſq; ſacramentum ſubſtitueret, ipſumq; ſe eſſe monſtraret, cui juravit Dominus & non pœnitebit eum: Tu es ſacerdos in æternum ſecundum ordinem Melchiſedec. Frangit autem ipſe panem quem diſcipulis porrigit, ut oſtendat corporis ſui fractionem non abſq; ſua ſponte ac procuratione venturam; ſed ſicut alibi dicit poteſtatem ſe habere ponendi animam ſuam, & poteſtatem ſe habere iterum ſumendi eam. Quem videlicet panem certè quoq; gratia ſacramenti, priuſquam frangeret benedixit. Quia naturam humanam quam paſſurus aſſumpſit, ipſe una cum patre & ſpiritu ſancto gratia divinæ virtutis implevit. Benedixit panem & fregit quia hominem aſſumptum ita morti ſubdere dignatus eſt, ut & divinæ immortalitatis veraciter ineſſe potentiam demonſtraret. Ideoq; velocius eum à morte reſuſcitandum eſſe doceret. Et accipiens calicem gratias egit, & dedit illis, dicens, Bibite ex hoc omnes. Cum appropinquare paſſioni dicitur, accepto pane & calice, gratiam egiſſe perhibetur; gratias ita; egit qui flagella alienæ iniquitatis ſuſcepit. Et qui nihil dignum percuſſioni exhibuit, humiliter in percuſſione benedixit. Ut hinc videlicet oſtendat, quid unuſquiſque in flagello culpæ propriæ facere debeat ſi ipſe æquanimiter flagella culpæ portat alienæ; ut hinc oſtendat, quid in correptione faciat ſubditus, ſi in flagello poſitus patri gratias agit æqualis. Hic eſt enim ſanguis meus novi Teſtamenti qui pro multis effundetur in remiſſionem peccatorum. Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum verò ſanguinem operatur in carne; hic ad corpus Chriſti myſtice, illud refertur ad ſanguinem. Verum quia & nos in Chriſto, & in nobis Chriſtum manere oportet, vinum Dominici calicis aqua miſcetur. Atteſtante enim Johanne, aquæ populi ſunt. Et neque aquam ſolam, neq; ſolum vinum, ſicut nec granum frumenti ſolum ſine admixtione aquæ & confectione, in panem cuiquam licet offerre, ne videlicet oblatio talis quaſi caput à membro ſecernendum

dum esse significet, & vel Christum sine nostræ redemptionis amore pati potuisse, vel nos sine illius passione salvari ac Patri offerri posse confingat. Quod autem dicit, Hic est sanguis meus novi Testamenti, ad distinctionem respicit veteris Testamenti, quod hircorum & vitulorum est sanguine dedicatum; dicente inter aspergendum legislatore, Hic est sanguis Testamenti quod mandavit ad vos Deus. Necesse est enim exemplaria quidem verorum his mundari; Ipsa autem Cœlestia melioribus hostiis quam istis, juxta quod Apostolus per totam ad Hebræos Epistolam, inter Legem distinguens & Evangelium, pulcherrima expositione ac plenaria ratione declarat. Dico autem vobis non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usq; in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. Vitem sive vineam Domini appellatam esse synagogam, & omnis sparsim scriptura & apertius testatur Isaias in Cantico de illo cantato, Vinea, inquiens, Domini Sabaoth, Domus Israel est. De qua nimirum vinea Dominus multo tempore bibebat, quamvis pluribus ramis in amaritudinem vitis alienæ conversis, quod tamen etsi multis in illâ plebe exorbitantibus à recto fidei itinere non defuere plurimi toto legis tempore, quorum piis cogitationibus summisque virtutibus delectaretur Deus. Verum passo in carne Domino ac resurgente à mortuis, tempus fuit ut legalis illa & figuralis observatio cessaret, atque ea quæ secundum literam gerebantur, in Spiritalem translata sensum, melius in novum Testamentum juvante Sancti Spiritus gratia tenerentur. Iturus igitur ad Passionem Dominus ait, Jam non bibam de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. At si apertè dicat: Non ultra Carnalibus Synagogæ Ceremoniis delectabor, in quibus etiam ista Paschalis agni sacra locum tenuere præcipuum: aderit enim tempus meæ resurrectionis: aderit dies ille cum ipse in regno Dei positus, id est gloriæ vitæ immortalis sublimatus, de salute populi ejusdem fontegratiæ spiritalis regenerati, novo vobiscum gaudio perfundar. Item, quod ait, Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei, vult intelligi hoc vetus esse, cum illud novum dicit; quia ergo de propagine Adam qui vetus homo appellatur Corpus susceperat, quod in passione morti traditurus erat: unde etiam per vini Sacramentum commendat sanguinem suum, quid aliud novum vinum nisi immortalitatem renovatorum corporum intelligere debemus?

Quod

Quod cum dicit, Vobiscum bibam, etiam ipsis resurrectionem Corporum ad induendam Immortalitatem promittit. Vobiscum enim non ad idem tempus, sed ad eandem innovationem dictum, accipiendum est. Nam & nos dicit Apostolus resurrexisse cum Christo ut spe rei futuræ jam lætitiam præsentem afferat: quod autem de hoc genimine vitis etiam illud novum esse dicit, significat utique eadem Corpora resurrectura secundum innovationem Cœlestem, quæ nunc secundum vetustatem moritura sunt. Si hanc vitem de cujus vetustate nunc passionis Calicem bibit, ipsos Judæos intellexeris. Significatum est etiam ipsam gentem ad Corpus Christi per novitatem vitæ accessuram; cum ingressa plenitudine gentium omnis Israel salvus fiet. Et hymno dicto exierunt in montem oliveti; hoc est quod in Psalmo legimus, Edent pauperes & saturabuntur; & laudabunt Dominum qui requirunt eum: Potest autem & hymnus etiam ille intelligi quem Dominus secundum Johannem patri gratias agens decantabat, in quo & pro seipso & pro Discipulis & pro eis qui per verbum eorum credituri erant, elevatis oculis sursum precabatur. Et pulchrè Discipulos sacramentis sui Corporis ac sanguinis imbutos, & hymno piæ intercessionis patri commendatos, in mentem educit olivarum, ut typicè designet nos per acceptionem sacramentorum suorum, perque opem suæ Intercessionis, ad altiora virtutum, ut carismate Sancti Spiritus in corde perungamur, conscendere debere.

'The Apostles being sate down at Table, Jesus Christ took 'Bread, blessed and brake it, and gave of it to his Disci'ples, saying to them, Take this and eat it, this is my Bo'dy. The ancient Ceremonies of the Antient Passover, 'which were used in memory of the Deliverance of the 'People of *Israel* being finished, he passeth on to the 'New, because he would have the same to be celebrated 'in his Church in commemoration of the Mystery of her 'Redemption, and to substitute the Sacrament of his Body 'and of his Blood, instead of the Flesh and Blood of the 'Paschal Lamb, and to shew that it was he himself to whom 'God had sworn, and shall never repent of it; Thou 'art the Eternal Priest according to the Order of *Melchi'zedeck*. Moreover, he himself breaks the Bread which he 'gives to his Disciples, that he might represent and make 'it appear, that the breaking of his Body would not be

'con-

'contrary to his inclination, or without his willingneſs to 'die: But, as he ſaith elſewhere, that he had power to 'give his life, and to deliver it up himſelf, as well as to 'take it again and raiſe himſelf from the Dead. He bleſ- 'ſed the Bread before he brake it, to aſſure us, that he 'intended to make a Sacrament of it; and foraſmuch as he 'had taken humane Nature upon him, that he might ſuf- 'fer, he with his Father and the Holy Spirit filled the ſame 'with the grace of a Virtue which was altogether Divine; 'and becauſe he was pleaſed to ſubmit the humane Nature 'he had taken upon him, to Death, he would make it ap- 'pear, that the ſaid Humanity was poſſeſt of a true and na- 'tural power to raiſe it ſelf: whereby he taught us, That 'the ſame would riſe more readily from the Dead. And 'taking the Cup, he gave Thanks to his Father, and gave it 'them to drink, ſaying, Drink ye all of it. When he 'drew near to the time of his Death and Paſſion; it is 'ſaid, that having taken the Bread and the Cup, he gave 'Thanks to his Eternal Father: he therefore who had taken 'upon him to expiate the Iniquities of others, gave Thanks 'to his Father, without having done any thing that was 'worthy of Death: he bleſſeth it with a profound Hu- 'mility, at the very time that he ſaw himſelf loaden with 'ſtripes; without doubt to inſtruct us, what every one 'of us ought to do when we find our ſelves laſhed with 'the whip and ſting of our Conſcience: For, if he who was 'innocent, endured with meekneſs and tranquillity the 'ſtripes due to the Iniquity of others; this was to teach 'and inſtruct us what he ought to do that is obnoxious, 'when he is corrected for his own Tranſgreſſions. If he 'ſuffered with an equal mind, the Scourge due for the Sins of 'others, this teaches us what a Subject ought to do when un- 'der the Divine Corrections; when he who is equal to the 'Father, gave Thanks to him when under his Scourges: *For* '*this is my Blood of the New Teſtament, which ſhall be ſhed for you all,* '*for the remiſſion of Sin*; becauſe he aſſures us, that the Bread be- 'comes his Body, and that the Wine doth operate and 'produce his Blood in the Fleſh. The Bread repreſents to 'us his Myſtical Body, and the Wine is the Symbol of

'his Blood. But, becauſe we muſt abide in Chriſt, and 'Chriſt muſt abide in us, we mingle Water with the Wine 'in the Cup of the Lord. And, as St. *John* witneſſeth, the 'People are Water, and it is not permitted to any body to 'offer Water alone, no more than the Wine alone; in 'like manner as it is forbidden to offer the Grains of 'Wheat, without their being mingled with Water, and 'ſo reduced to Bread, for fear leſt ſuch an Oblation might 'ſignifie, that the Head ought to be ſeparated from its 'Members, and that Jeſus Chriſt could have ſuffered, 'without an extreme love and deſire of our Redemption; 'or that this Oblation did not give us ground to believe, 'that we might be ſaved, or offered up to his Father 'without the Myſtery of his Paſſion. As for his ſaying, '*This is my Blood of the New Teſtament*, 'tis that we might make 'a diſtinction between the new Covenant and the old, 'which was conſecrated with the effuſion of the Blood of 'Goats and Oxen, as the Lawgiver ſaid, at the ſprinkling 'of it; this is the Blood of the Covenant which God 'has commanded you: For it is neceſſary that the Patterns 'of true things, ſhould be purified by theſe; but that 'the Heavenly Places ſhould be purified with more ex-'cellent Sacrifices, according to what the Apoſtle S. *Paul* 'declares throughout his whole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, 'where he makes a diſtinction between the Law and the 'Goſpel. He declares, by an excellent and ample Expli-'cation, *Verily, verily, this I ſay unto you, I will drink no more of the Vine, till I ſhall drink it new in the Kingdom of my Father.* 'The whole Scripture openly declares, That the 'Synagogue is called the Vine of the Lord; the Prophet '*Iſaiah* openly ſets this forth in his Song, where he ſpeaks 'of it in theſe words; *The Houſe of* Iſrael *is the Lord's Vine.* 'Tis indeed of this Vine that the Lord drank large 'draughts, though many Branches thereof were infected 'with the bitterneſs of a ſtrange Vine; and though in the 'mean time many of the People are gone aſtray from the 'true way of the Faith, yet there were ſtill found a great 'many, during the whole time of the Law, who glorified 'God by their holy and godly thoughts, and by the Pra-

'ctice

'ctice of their Heroical Virtues. But Jeſus Chriſt having 'ſuffered in the Fleſh that was capable of ſuffering, and being 'raiſed from the Dead, the time is come, that hath put an 'end to theſe legal and figurative obſervations: All thoſe 'things that were obſerved according to the Letter, have 'been changed into a ſpiritual ſence, and have been con-'firmed in the New Teſtament by the Grace of the Holy 'Ghoſt. Jeſus Chriſt then going to ſuffer, ſaith, *I ſhall drink no more of this Juice of the Vine, until the day that I ſhall drink it new with you in the Kingdom of my Father.* 'As if he 'had plainly ſaid, I will no longer take delight in the car-'nal Ceremonies of the Synagogue, amongſt the number 'of which, the great Feſtival of the Paſchal Lamb was 'one of the chiefeſt; For, this ſhall be the time of my 'Reſurrection; that very day I ſhall be lifted up to the 'Kingdom of Heaven; that is to ſay, to the Kingdom of 'a new life of Immortality; I ſhall be filled together with 'you, with a new joy for the Salvation of my People, 'which ſhall be born again in the Spring of one and the 'ſame Grace. In like manner alſo when he ſaith, *I ſhall* '*not drink of this juice of the Vine, until the day that I ſhall* '*drink it new with you in the Kingdom of my Father.* He would 'be underſtood of the Old Teſtament, when he calls it 'New: And therefore ſince he had taken a Body from 'the Family of *Adam*, who is called the Old Man, and 'that this his Body was now to be expoſed to death; '*'tis for this reaſon that by the Sacrament of Wine he recom-*'*mends to us his Blood.* What are we to underſtand by this 'New Wine, but the Immortality of our Renewed Bo-'dies? For when he ſaith, I will drink it with you, he 'promiſeth to them alſo the Reſurrection of their Bodies, 'in order to their being clothed with Immortality. For 'this word *Vobiſcum* with you, muſt not be taken as ſpo-'ken of the ſame time, but as importing that the Diſci-'ples ſhould in time to come be renewed as well as 'he. For, doth not the Apoſtle ſay, that we are all raiſed 'again with Chriſt, that our future Reſurrection might af-'ford us preſent Joy? And whereas he ſaith *of this Juice* '*of the Vine*, and calls it alſo new, this for certain ſig-

'nifies, that the ſame Bodies muſt be raiſed again, accor-
'ding to the Rules of an altogether Heavenly Renovati-
'on, though at preſent they muſt die, according to the
'Old Man. If you underſtand the *Jews* by this Vine, from
'the oldneſs of which, he at preſent now drinks the Cup of his
'Paſſion; it hath alſo been ſignified to us, That that
'Nation muſt approach to the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, by
'the change of a new life: *The whole Houſe of Iſrael ſhall*
'*be ſaved, together with all its company, which ſhall enter with*
'*them.* After they had ſung an Hymn, they went to the
'Mount of *Olives*. This is that which we read in the Pſal-
'miſt; *The Poor ſhall eat and be filled, and they that ſeek the*
'*Lord ſhall praiſe him.* This Hymn may be alſo underſtood,
'according to the account St. *John* gives of it, to be that which
'Jeſus Chriſt ſang, when he gave Thanks to his Eternal Fa-
'ther, wherein he prayed for himſelf, for his Diſciples, and
'for all thoſe who ſhould believe at their preaching. And
''tis not without cauſe that he leads his Diſciples to the
'Mount of *Olives*, after having fed them with the Sacraments
'of his Body and his Blood, and after his having recommen-
'ded them to his Father, by the Hymn of a ten-
'der interceſſion; to inform us, without doubt, that it is
'by receiving of the Sacraments, and by the aſſiſtance of
'his Prayer, that we muſt come to the Poſſeſſion of
'Heroical Virtues, and that it is by this means alone,
'that we ſhall receive in our Hearts the Unctions of the
'Holy Spirit.

We find by this Extract, that he followed the notions of the Primitive Church cloſely on this Subject, and that the Church which bordered upon the Mountains of the Alps, did not entertain any Opinions like thoſe of *Paſchaſius*. We ought to obſerve here, as a thing natural and obvious, that if he endur'd ſome Contradiction, upon other Articles, yet he never was impleaded about that of the Euchariſt, which ſhews that that Truth, at that time, was yet in poſſeſſion of its own rights, and that thoſe who quarrel'd with him about other Articles, as, *Jonas* Biſhop of *Orleans*, *Dungalus* and the Abbot *Theodemirus*, were of his Opinion about the matter of the Euchariſt. For ſeeing his Commentary,

mentary upon St. *Matthew* was publiſhed in the year 815. and that *Theodemirus* continued ſtill his Friend in 823. preſſing him to write on the Old Teſtament, it is evident that till then nothing had interrupted the good correſpondence that was between them

Mabillon has publiſhed an extract from the end of his Work upon *Leviticus* dedicated to Abbot *Theodemirus*, which ſhows the great care that he took to withdraw thoſe of his Dioceſs, from the hanckering they had after the worſhip of Creatures, and the troubles and croſſes he had met with from thoſe, who were willing to defend their Superſtitions.

'Becauſe you have commanded me to write theſe things, 'I have undertaken it, not as for your Inſtruction, but for 'your Satisfaction. But it is your duty to judge of it with 'more truth, and to ſtir up your ſelf by your Examples, 'to the practice of a true Charity, which is the moſt ex- 'cellent of all Virtues. And I aſſure my ſelf, that I 'may more eaſily attain to the poſſeſſion of that vertue, by 'means of your Prayers, than by any ſtrength of my own. 'See here, my dear Brother, what I have here anſwered, 'as well as I could, to certain demands you have made 'of me. And I earneſtly deſire you on this occaſion, that 'if you have diſcovered, or can find, for time to come, 'any thing better, concerning the things about which you 'command me to write unto you, we ſhall take it very 'kindly, if you ſhall be pleaſed to communicate the ſame 'to us; for I am naturally more inclin'd to learn, than to 'teach others. For this Beauty of the Eternal Truth 'and Wiſdom (God grant I may always have a conſtant 'will to enjoy her, for the Love of whom we have alſo 'undertaken this work) doth not exclude thoſe that come 'unto her, becauſe of the great number of hearers ſhe 'hath, ſhe grows not old by length of time, ſhe minds 'not places, ſhe does dot ſuffer her ſelf to be overtaken 'by night, ſhe does not ſhut up her ſelf in ſhadows, 'and doth not expoſe her ſelf to our Bodily Senſes: She 'is near unto all thoſe that turn themſelves to her, from 'all parts of the World, and who love her indeed, ſhe is 'Eternal

Analect. T. 1. pag. 36, 37, 38, 39.

'Eternal to all; ſhe is not limited by any places, ſhe is eve-
'ry where: She advertiſeth abroad, ſhe inſtructs
'within, ſhe changes and converts thoſe that behold
'her: She doth not ſuffer her ſelf to be violated by
'any perſon. No Man can judge of her, no body can
'judge well without her. In this Idea of my Faith, I ſe-
'parate all change and alteration from Eternity, and in this
'Eternity I diſcover no ſpace of time, for the ſpaces of time
'are made up of future and paſt motions of things; now
'there is nothing paſt or future in Eternity: for that
'which paſſeth ceaſeth to be, and that which is to come,
'has not yet begun to be: but as for Eternity it is that
'which is always preſent, nor ever has been, ſo as not to
'be preſent ſtill; nor ever ſhall be, but ſo as ſtill to con-
'tinue preſent; becauſe it is ſhe alone that can ſay to the
'Spirit of Man, 'Tis I who am the Lord, and 'tis of her
'alone we can ſay with truth, he who is Eternal has
'ſent me.

'And ſince this is the caſe, we are not commanded
'to go to the Creature that we may be happy,
'but to the Creator who alone can conſtitute our Bliſs;
'of whom if we entertain other Opinions than we ought
'to have, we involve our ſelves in a very pernicious Er-
'ror. For as long as we ſhall endeavour to come to
'that, which is not, or which, ſuppoſing it to be, yet
'doth not make us happy, we ſhall never be able to ar-
'rive at a happy life. A Man doth not become happy
'becauſe another is ſo, but when a Man imitates another,
'that he may become ſuch as he is, he deſires immedi-
'ately to become happy by the ſame means, he finds another
'is become ſo, that is, by the enjoyment of this univer-
'ſal and unchangeable truth. Neither can a Man become
'prudent by the Prudence of another, or valiant by
'the valour, or temperate by the temperance, or juſt
'by the juſtice of another; but by forming and faſhion-
'ing his Mind by the immutable Rules and Splendors
'of thoſe Virtues, which without alteration ſhine forth in
'this common univerſal Truth and Wiſdom: In imita-
'tion of whom he formed and ſquared his manners, whom

'we

'we propoſe to our ſelves as a Pattern to imitate, and 'whom we look upon as a living Copy of that Eternal 'Wiſdom. Our will faſtning it ſelf and cleaving to this 'unchangeable and common good, affords the firſt and 'great good things Man is capable of, becauſe ſhe is a 'certain mean good. But when the will of Man ſepa-'rates it ſelf from this unchangeable and common good, 'and ſeeks her own particular good, or directs her ſelf 'to any outward or inferiour good, ſhe ſins.

After this he quotes an excellent Paſſage of St. *Auſtin*, from his Treatiſe concerning the True Religion. 'Where-'fore we owe no Religious worſhip to thoſe who are 'departed this Life, becauſe they have lived religiouſly; 'we muſt not look upon them as perſons that require our 'Adorations and Homage, but they deſire that he may 'be worthy of our reſpect, by whom, they being enlight-'ned, rejoyce to ſee us made partakers of their Piety. 'We muſt therefore honour them, becauſe they deſerve 'to be imitated; but we muſt not worſhip them with 'an act of Religion. And if they have liv'd wickedly, 'we do not owe them any reſpect at all, in what part 'ſoever of the World they be. That then which is ho-'noured by the higheſt Angel, muſt alſo be honoured by 'the loweſt of Men, becauſe the nature of Man is become 'the loweſt, for not having honoured him. For an An-'gel takes not his Wiſdom elſewhere than Man does. 'The Truth of an Angel, and that of Man, are both 'derived from the ſame Fountain, that is from one and 'the ſame Eternal Truth and Wiſdom. For by a pure 'effect of that Eternal Wiſdom, it comes to paſs that the 'power of God, and that unchangeable Wiſdom Conſub-'ſtantial and Coeternal with the Father, hath vouch-'ſafed in order to the accompliſhment of the adorable 'Myſtery of our Salvation, to take our humane nature 'upon him, that he might teach us, that we owe our 'adorations to him who alone deſerves to be worſhipped 'by all intelligent and rational Creatures. We ought 'alſo to believe that thoſe good Angels, which are the 'moſt excellent Miniſters of God, would have us to 'worſhip

St. *Auguſt. de vera Relig. c.* 55.

'worſhip one only God together with them, by the 'alone viſion of whom they are happy. For we are not 'happy in beholding the Angels, neither can that viſion 'ever make us ſo, but we ſhall be happy by beholding 'the Truth, by means of which we love the Angels, 'and congratulate them. Neither do we envy their hap- 'pineſs, becauſe they are more active than we, and be- 'cauſe they enjoy the viſion of God, without being mo- 'leſted with any trouble; but rather love them ſo much 'the more, becauſe our hope puts us upon expecting 'ſomething anſwerable to theſe their excellencies, from 'him who is the God of us both. Wherefore we ho- 'nour them with our charitable reſpects; but not like 'Slaves: we build no Temples to them, neither will 'they be honour'd by us in any ſuch manner, becauſe they 'know that we whilſt we are good, are the Temples of the 'living God. After his quoting of this paſſage ſee how he concludes his Work.

'Theſe things are the higheſt and ſtrongeſt myſteries of 'our Faith, and characters moſt deeply imprinted in our 'Hearts. In ſtanding up for the confirmation and defence 'of which truth, I am become a reproach to my Neigh- 'bours, to that degree, that thoſe who ſee us do not 'only ſcoff at us, but point at us, one to another: but 'God the Father of Mercies, and Author of all Conſo- 'lations, has comforted us in all our Afflictions, that we 'might be able, in like manner, to comfort thoſe that are 'preſt with ſorrow and affliction; we rely upon the Pro- 'tection of him who has armed and fortified us with 'the Armour of Righteouſneſs and of Faith, which is the 'tried Shield for our Eternal Salvation.

He ſeems in theſe words to allude to the complaints that had been made againſt him, at *Ludovicus Pius*'s Court, for having broke down Images throughout his Dioceſs, and for writing, in defence of himſelf, a Treatiſe againſt the adoration of Images, the worſhip of Saints, Pilgrimages, the worſhip of Reliques, with other ſuch like Superſtitions. And ſince the cruel diligence of the Inquiſitors, has deſtroyed this piece, we muſt gueſs at the time wherein he wrote

wrote it, from the account his adverſaries give us thereof, *viz. Theodemirus*, *Dungalus* and *Jonas* of *Orleans*, and ſearch in their Books for his true Opinions, and the Arguments he made uſe of againſt the Defenders of Superſtition.

Dungalus wrote in the year 828. as appears clearly from what he mentions of the Decree paſt in *Ludovicus Pius*'s his Palace, after the Aſſembly of *Paris*, in the year 825. about the matter of Images, as a thing which happened two years before. In his Book he accuſeth *Claudius* for taking upon him, after 820. years and more, to reprove thoſe things that were paſt in continual uſe, as if there had been none before him that ever had any Zeal for Religion; from whence it is evident, that *Claudius* wrote ſince the year 820. It ſeems indeed as if he had anſwered the Abbot *Theodemirus* after the year 823. who had intimated to him the offence that was taken at his Behaviour and Opinions, which he did ſo effectually as not to have any need to write another Treatiſe upon the ſame Subject.

However 'tis *Dungalus* himſelf who has preſerved the Extracts of the Apologetical anſwer, which *Claudius* made about that time to the Abbot *Theodemirus*; which Apologetick he begins in this manner: 'I have received (ſaith he to *Theodemirus*) 'by a particular bearer thy Letter, with 'the Articles, wholly ſtuffed with babling and fooleries. 'You declare in theſe Articles, That you have been 'troubled that my fame was ſpread, not only throughout 'all *Italy*, but alſo in *Spain* and elſewhere; as if I had 'formerly, and ſtill do preach a new Sect, contrary to the 'Rules of the Antient Catholick Faith, which is moſt ab'ſolutely falſe: Neither is it any wonder at all, if the 'Members of Satan talk of me at this rate, who have 'alſo called our Head a Deceiver, one that hath a De'vil, *&c.* For I teach no new Sect, as keeping my ſelf 'to the Pure Truth, preaching and publiſhing nothing but 'that; but on the contrary, as far as in me lies, I have 'repreſſed, oppoſed, caſt down and deſtroyed, and do 'ſtill repreſs, oppoſe and deſtroy, to the utmoſt of my

'Power, all Sects, Schisms, Superstitions and Heresies: 'and shall never cease so to do, by the assistance of God, 'as far as I am able: for since it is expressly said, *Thou 'shalt not make to thy self the resemblance of any thing, either 'in Heaven or on Earth*, &c. This is not alone to be understood of the Images and resemblances of strange Gods, 'but also of those of Celestial Creatures.

'These kind of People, against whom we have undertaken to defend the Church of God, tell us, if thou 'write upon the Wall, or drawest the Images of *Peter* 'or of *Paul*, of *Jupiter*, *Saturn* or of *Mercury*; neither are 'the one of these Gods, nor the other Apostles, and 'neither the one nor the other of them are Men, and 'therefore the name is changed: and in the mean time 'both then and now, the same ever continues still. Surely if we ought to worship them, we ought rather to 'worship them alive, than as thou hast represented them, 'as the pourtraitures of Beasts, or (what is yet more true) 'of Stone or Wood, which have neither life, nor feeling, 'nor reason: for if we may neither worship nor serve 'the works of God's hand, how much less may we worship the works of Mens hands, and adore them in honour of those, whose resemblances we say they are? for 'if the Image you worship is not God (for not only he 'who serves and honours visible Images, but also whatsoever Creature else, whether heavenly or earthly, whether Spiritual or Corporal, he serves the same instead of 'God, and from it he looks for the Salvation of his Soul, 'which he ought to look for from God alone, and is of 'the number of those, of whom the Apostle saith, That 'they worshipped and served the Creature more than the 'Creator. Wherefore dost thou bow to false Images, and wherefore like a slave dost thou bend thy Body to pitiful shrines, and to the work of Mens hands?

'But mark what the followers of the False Religion and 'Superstition do alledge; They say 'tis in Commemoration 'and in honour of our Saviour that we serve, honour and 'adore the Cross, whom nothing pleaseth in our Saviour, but 'that which was pleasing to the ungodly, *viz.* The reproach

'of

'of his Paſſion, and the token of his Death. They witneſs 'hereby, that they perceive only of him, what the wicked 'ſaw and perceived of him, whether Jews or Heathens, who 'do not ſee his Reſurrection, and do not conſider him, but 'as altogether ſwallowed up of Death, without minding 'what the Apoſtle ſaith, We know Jeſus Chriſt no longer 'according to the Fleſh.

'God commands one thing, and theſe People do quite 'the contrary; God commands us to bear our Croſs, and 'not to worſhip it; but theſe are all for worſhipping it, 'whereas they do not bear it at all, neither will they 'bear it either corporally or ſpiritually: to ſerve God af-'ter this manner, is to go a whoring from him. For if we 'ought to adore the Croſs, becauſe Chriſt was faſtned to 'it, how many other things are there which touched Je-'ſus Chriſt, and which he made according to the Fleſh? 'Did not he continue nine Months in the Womb of the 'Virgin? Why don't they then on the ſame ſcore wor-'ſhip all that are Virgins, becauſe a Virgin brought 'forth Jeſus Chriſt? Why don't they adore Mangers, and 'old Clouts, becauſe he was laid in a Manger, and wrapt 'in Swadling-cloaths? Why don't they adore Fiſher-boats, 'becauſe he ſlept in one of them, and preached to the 'Multitudes, and cauſed a Net to be caſt out, wherewith 'was caught a miraculous quantity of Fiſh? Let them 'adore Aſſes, becauſe he entered into *Jeruſalem* upon the 'Foal of an Aſs; and Lambs, becauſe it is written of 'him, *Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the ſins of the 'World.* But theſe ſort of Men would rather eat live 'Lambs, than worſhip their Images. Why don't they 'worſhip Lions, becauſe he is called the Lion of the Tribe 'of *Judah*? or Rocks, becauſe it is ſaid, *And the Rock was 'Chriſt*? or Thorns, becauſe he was crowned with them? or 'Launces, becauſe one of them pierced his Side?

'All theſe things are ridiculous, rather to be lamented 'than ſet forth in writing; but we are forced to ſet them 'down, in oppoſition to Fools, and to declaim againſt 'thoſe hearts of Stone, whom the arrows and ſentences 'of the Word of God cannot pierce, and therefore we

'are fain to fling ſuch Stones at them. Come to your 'ſelves again, ye miſerable Tranſgreſſors; why are you 'gone aſtray from Truth, and why, being become vain, 'are ye fallen in love with Vanity? Why do you Cru-'cifie again the Son of God, and expoſe him to open 'ſhame? and by this means make Souls by troops, to 'become the Companions of Devils, eſtranging them 'from their Creator, by the horrible Sacriledge of your 'Images and likeneſſes, and precipitating them into everlaſting 'Damnation?

'And as for your reproaching me, that I hinder Men from 'running in Pilgrimage to *Rome*; I will firſt demand of you 'your ſelf, whether thou knoweſt, that to go to *Rome* is 'to repent or do Penance? if it be ſo indeed, why then 'haſt thou for ſo long a time damned ſo many Souls, 'whom thou haſt kept up in thy Monaſtery, and whom 'thou haſt taken into it, that they might there do Pe-'nance, obliging them to ſerve thee, inſtead of ſending 'them to *Rome*, if it be ſo that the way to do Penance, 'be to go to *Rome*, and yet thou haſt hindred them? 'What have you to ſay againſt this ſentence, That whoſo-'ever ſhall lay a Stone of ſtumbling, before any of theſe 'little ones, it were better for him, that a Milſtone were 'hung about his neck, and he caſt into the bottom of 'the Sea?

'We know very well that this Paſſage of the Goſpel 'is very ill underſtood; *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock 'will I build my Church, and I will give unto thee the Keys of the 'Kingdom of Heaven:* under the pretence of which words 'the ſtupid and ignorant common People, deſtitute of all 'Spiritual knowledge, betake themſelves to *Rome*, in hopes 'of acquiring Eternal Life: for the Miniſtry does be-'long to all the true Superintendents and Paſtors of the 'Church, who diſcharge the ſame, as long as they are in 'this World, and when they have pay'd the debt of 'Death, others ſucceed in their places, who enjoy the ſame 'Authority and Power.

Return,

'Return, O ye blind, to your Light, return to him who 'enlightens every Man that cometh into the World; 'all of you, as many as you be, who do not keep only 'to this Light, you walk in Darkneſs, and know not 'whither you go; for the darkneſs has put out your 'Eyes. If we muſt believe God when he promiſeth, 'how much more when he ſwears, and ſaith, That if '*Noah*, *Daniel* and *Job* (that is, if the Saints, whom you 'call upon, were endowed with as great Holineſs, as great 'Righteouſneſs, and as much Merit, as theſe were) 'they ſhall neither deliver Son nor Daughter: and 'tis 'for this end he makes this Declaration, *viz.* That none 'might put their confidence either in the Merits 'or the Interceſſion of Saints. Underſtand ye this, ye 'People, without underſtanding? ye Fools, when will 'ye be Wiſe? ye who run to *Rome*, to ſeek there for the In-'terceſſion of an Apoſtle. What think you would St. *Au-'guſtin* ſay of you, whom we have already ſo often 'quoted, *&c.*

'The fifth thing you reproach me for, is, That it diſpleaſeth 'thee, that the Apoſtolick Lord (for ſo you are pleaſed to 'call the late Pope *Paſchal* deceaſed) had honoured me 'with this charge; but foraſmuch as the word, *Apoſtolicus, dicitur quaſi Apoſtoli cuſtos*, may intimate as much as the Apo-'ſtles Keeper, Know thou, that he only is apoſtolick, who 'is the Keeper and Guardian of the Apoſtle's Doctrine, and 'not he who boaſts himſelf to be ſeated in the Chair of the 'Apoſtle, and in the mean time doth not acquit himſelf of 'the Charge of the Apoſtle, for the Lord ſaith, That the '*Scribes* and *Phariſees* ſate in *Moſes's* Chair.

Now, becauſe *Jonas* of *Orleans* had no other Extracts out of the Book of *Claudius*, beſides thoſe that had been already refuted by *Dungalus*, a Recluſe of the Abby of St. *Denys*, therefore he confines himſelf to refute the ſame Opinions of *Claudius*, which he did only in the year 840, about a year after *Claudius* his death; whereupon I deſire the Reader to conſider, *Firſt*, That notwithſtanding *Dungalus* and *Jonas* did both write by the order of Kings, and that they make mention of a Condemnation of *Claudius* paſt

paſt in the Palace, yet nothing of all this was able to ſhake the Reputation of *Claudius*. He wrote againſt all theſe Superſtitions from the year 823, and did not die till the Year 839; ſo that for ſixteen years together, he was only ſet upon by ſome particular Perſons, by an obſcure and recluſe Monk, who was a Stranger to *France*, and who probably being an *Italian*, took part with the Church of *Rome*, at that time engaged for the Worſhippers of Idols.

Secondly, That the Fathers of the Aſſembly of *Paris*, in the year 825, had juſtified moſt of the Principles maintain'd by *Claudius*, this great man having been only engaged to carry the matter farther than they, for being nearer to the Dioceſs of *Rome*, he ſaw the danger ſo much the nearer, in which his Flock were, of falling into Idolatry.

Thirdly, That to go to the bottom of the matter, *Agobardus* Archbiſhop of *Lions*, puſh'd that Point as far as *Claudius* himſelf; as appears from his Treatiſe againſt Pictures. 'Tis a pleaſure to ſee how Father *Raynaud* torments himſelf to juſtifie *Agobardus*, whom the Church of *Lions* honours as a Saint, though he has made uſe of the ſame Arguments that *Claudius* did, and given large Teſtimonies of his being as vigorous an *Iconoclaſt*, as ever *Claudius* was. We may therefore aſſert without raſhneſs, That either all the Fetches of *Baronius*, and of *F. Raynaud*, are not ſufficient to keep *Agobardus* in the Martyrology of *Lions*; or, that they ſerve very profitably, at the ſame time, to enroll *Claudius* in that of the Church of *Turin*, as a moſt holy and moſt illuſtrious Biſhop, becauſe of his Doctrine, his ardent Piety, and the great care he took to oppoſe the Spirit of Superſtition, which reign'd ſo much at that time.

Fourthly, After all, we may ſay, that neither *Dungalus* nor *Jonas* of *Orleans*, maintained the Opinion of the Church of *Rome* that was then: *Jonas* makes mention of the Pope's Party, as a Party not wholly cut off from the Communion of the Church; but his expreſſions are ſo ſharp, that it appears he had little better Opinion of them. They condemn all manner of Worſhip of Images, and ſtick cloſe to the Deciſions of *Francfort*, in the year 794, and of *Paris* 826, which

which were diametrically oppoſite to the definitions of the *Iconolatra* or Worſhippers of Images, and to the Pretenſions of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who had admitted of them.

It was worth our while to take notice of theſe Opinions of *Claudius*, and of the manner of his reforming his Dioceſs, that we might make it appear, that he laid ſolid Principles of the Reformation in thoſe parts as to ſeveral points. And this was the more neceſſary, becauſe the Papiſts, as *Genebrard* in his Chronology and *Ravenez*, have owned, That the Vallies of *Piedmont*, which did belong to the Biſhoprick of *Turin*, preſerved the Opinions of *Claudius* in the Ninth and Tenth Century.

We ought to obſerve two things, which very well deſerve an exact reflection; the firſt is, That *Angilbertus* Biſhop of *Milan*, is conſtantly repreſented to us by *Ripamontius*, by *Ughellus*, and thoſe who have wrote the Hiſtory of that Dioceſs, as one who began to ſeparate himſelf from the Pope, by a kind of Schiſm, which they highly lament, as bordering upon Rebellion, which they own to have laſted above Two Hundred years. But the caſe is not ſo as they are pleaſed to repreſent it to us, the truth is, That that Prelate preſerved his Liberty againſt all the Pope's endeavours, wherein he was imitated by his Succeſſors, who ſeem to have had no more value than he had for the Decretals of the ancient Popes, which were foiſted in by the care and Emiſſaries of the Roman See, in order to ſubmit the Rights and Priviledges of other Churches to Her.

The ſecond is, That though the Emulation which was between the Biſhops of *Milan* and *Aquileia*, was an occaſion of great Conteſts between them, yet we find, that the Dioceſs of *Aquileia* was no more united with that of the Pope, during the time of the Controverſie concerning the Proceſſion, *ex utroque* [from both] under *Nicolaus* the Firſt, and under *Photius*. This appears evidently from a Letter of *Photius*, who having received at *Conſtantinople* a Biſhop Legate from the Archbiſhop of *Aquileia*, wrote an Anſwer to him, as to a man who was wholly of his Opinion. Father *Combefis* has publiſhed this Letter. *Auct. Noviſſ.* P. 527. *& ſeq.*

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The Faith of the Churches of Italy *in the Tenth Century.*

FOraſmuch as this Century was generally devoted to Ignorance and Debauchery, and very barren of Authors, it will be hard for us to inform our ſelves any thing in particular concerning the Churches of *Italy*, except only ſo far as we make our conjectures of it, by conſidering the condition of other Weſtern Churches, which was as deplorable as can well be imagined. This is owned by the Papiſts themſelves, by *Caranza*, *Genebrard*, *Baronius*, and many more, who deſcribe this Tenth Century, as a monſtrous Age. Indeed, we can ſcarce expect that it ſhould have been better at that time, if we conſider the furious Wars that waſted this Dioceſs, as well by reaſon of the Invaſion of the *Huns*, as by the Diviſions happening between ſeveral Princes, who endeavoured to make themſelves Maſters of that part of *Italy*, after the death of *Charles* the Great.

Tom. 2. *Spic.* p. 161. *& ſeq.*

But Providence has preſerved us two Authors of this Dioceſs, the one is *Ratherius*, who alone might have been ſufficient to inform us very exactly about the ſtate of *Italy*. This *Ratherius* Biſhop of *Verona*, who from being a Monk in the Abby of *Lobe*, near to *Liege*, was advanced to the See of *Verona*, in the year 928, and being chas'd from thence in 932, was made Biſhop of *Liege*, in the year 954, and died in 974, ſo that he was Biſhop during the moſt part of the Tenth Century.

Sigebertus informs us that the Hereſie of the *Anthropomorphites* began to appear again in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, during his Pontificate, and that he was obliged to write againſt them. And indeed, we find a large Digreſſion of *Ratherius* upon this occaſion in his firſt Sermon of *Lent*. He obſerves, that the Prieſts of the Dioceſs of *Vicenza* were of this Opinion, which they grounded upon the following paſ-

Paſſages of Scripture, *Pſal.* 33. 16, *Job* 10. 8. and *Geneſ.* 1. 26. He acknowledges, that other People of his Dioceſs were of the ſame opinion, and that they could no otherwiſe conceive the Exiſtence of God. He ingenuouſly confeſſeth, that this Belief was grown in the minds of the People, becauſe in the Pictures and Images they ſaw God ſeated like a King, on a Throne, and the Angels in the ſhape of Men with Wings, array'd in white. Behold here the happy effect of Images upon an ignorant People, and what may be expected from theſe ſort of Books which the Prophet *Habakkuk* ſo juſtly calls *The Teachers of Lies.*

He gives us an account in the ſame Sermon of a very pleaſant fancy of the People of his Dioceſs: They believed that St. *Michael* the Archangel celebrated the Maſs of the ſecond *Feria*, whence they were perſwaded, that the Maſs of St. *Michael*, called the ſecond *Feria*, was far more excellent than any other Maſs whatſoever. 'Tis worth our obſerving, how he confutes this phantaſtical Opinion; *Firſt*, He maintains from *Revel.* 21. 22. that there is no Temple in Heaven. *Secondly*, He proves, that the Angels cannot celebrate Maſs, becauſe we ought not to believe, that the Angels eat or drink Corporeal Bread and Wine; and that Jeſus Chriſt is only called the bread of Angels, becauſe they are nouriſhed with his Praiſes, as with Food. Be it as it will, it appears very plainly, that neither this groſs People, nor their Biſhops, who endeavour'd to diſabuſe them, were very well inform'd of the Myſteries of the Church of *Rome*; for otherwiſe, why doth not this good Biſhop tell his People, that the Angels were not capable of the character of Prieſthood? How could he object to them, that the Angels cannot eat or drink corporeal Bread and Wine, but the ſubſtance of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, which exiſt therein in the manner of a Spirit? Is it any contradiction to ſuppoſe, that Spirits may truly receive a Body which exiſts after the manner of a Spirit? It is very plain, that though, may be, he might have embraced ſome of the Hypotheſes of *Paſchaſius*, which through the ſtupidity of that People, were ſwallowed down by little and little, yet he did not know the whole of it. It was neceſſary, that *Lanfranc*, *Guitmond*, and *Alger*,

ſhould make an end of licking this Bear into ſome ſhape, as being but half formed by its Author, when at firſt it was brought forth.

But not to inſiſt longer on this, I obſerve two things, the firſt is, That this Author, who had been brought up in a ſtrange Country, and who probably had brought along with him his notions from thence; ſeems in divers points to follow the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius* upon this Queſtion. The ſecond is, That notwithſtanding that, he doth up and down make uſe of a number of notions and expreſſions, which directly oppoſe and overthrow it.

p. 258. On the one hand he tells the Prieſts of his Dioceſs, in his Synodical Epiſtle, *Paranda cordium noſtrorum habitacula, venturo ad nos, per corporis & ſanguinis ſui ſubſtantiam, Chriſto.* 'We ought to prepare the Habitations of our Heart, for 'Chriſt, who is to come into us by the Subſtance of his Bo'dy and Blood.

p. 259. And on the other hand, he tells us, That wicked Prieſts eat the Goat and not the Lamb, which is alſo the expreſſion of *Odo Cluniacenſis*, who lived at the ſame time. An altogether incomprehenſible expreſſion in the mouth of a man that believes Tranſubſtantiation.

p. 181. In his Treatiſe of the Contempt of the Canons, *par.* 1. he quotes a Paſſage of *Zeno* Biſhop of *Verona*, which overthrows Tranſubſtantiation. It is found in a Sermon concerning *Judah* and *Thamar*, in theſe words: *Omnium corruptè viventium Diabolus pater eſt, & ò quam non manducat verendam carnem Domini, nec bibit ejus ſanguinem, in quo Diabolus per tria iſta vitia, hoc eſt ſuperbiam, hypocriſin atq; luxuriam requieſcit, licet communicare cum fidelibus videatur, Domino dicente, qui manducat meam carnem, & bibit meum ſanguinem, in me manet, & ego in eo. Cum & per converſionem ita hoc poſſit reſolvi; qui in me manet, & ego in eo, ipſe manducat carnem meam, & bibit ſanguinem meum. In quo enim Deus manet, & ipſe in Deo, quomodo in eo Diabolus dormire poſſit non video: dormit verò in eo qui per hypocriſin, vel elationem umbroſus & vacuus, per luxuriam exiſtit humectus. Quid ergo manducat, quando communicat? Judicium ſi reſpondes, Apoſtolo convives, & intelligere me pariter commones, quia quo eo judicabitur, id eſt damnabitur; quia cum indignus exiſtens, Chriſti*

Christi est usus carnem manducare, & sanguinem bibere; ac propterea quod debuerit illi fore salvatio, est factum damnatio. De substantia verò corporali quam sumit, cum sit mea nunc quæstio, mihi nunc quoq; ipsi lo;uar, ita succumbo; cum sit enim digne sumenti vera caro, panis licet quod olim fuerat, videatur & sanguis, quod vinum; indigne sumenti, id est non in Deo manenti, quid sit, nedum dicibile, incogitabile fate r mihi, & altiora te, ne quæsieris, & profundiora te ne scrutatus fueris, dictum putare hinc quoque mihi.

'The Devil is the Father of all those that live wickedly: and, 'O how far is he from eating the venerable Body of our Lord 'and drinking his Blood, in whom the Devil rests, by means 'of these three Vices, *Pride*, *Hypocrisie*, and *Luxury*, though 'he may seem to communicate with the Faithful? Our 'Lord telling us, *He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood, abides 'in me, and I in him*: which words may be translated thus; 'He who abides in me, and I in him, he it is that eats my 'Flesh and drinks my Blood. For he in whom God abides, 'and he in God, how the Devil can take up his rest in such 'an one, I see not; but the Devil doth rest in him, who by 'reason of Hypocrisie and Pride, is shadowy and empty, and 'dissolved by Luxury. What then doth such an one eat 'when he communicates? If thou answerest *Judgment*, 'thou agreest with the Apostle, and puttest me in mind to 'understand, that he shall therefore be judged, that is, con-'demned, because being unworthy, he durst venture to eat 'Christ's Flesh, and drink his Blood; and therefore that which 'was to have been his Salvation, is become his Damnation. 'But whereas my enquiry at present, is, concerning the Bodi-'ly Substance he receives, I must now answer my self, and 'own that here I am at a loss; for since it is true Flesh to the 'worthy Receiver, though it be the Bread it was before; and 'Blood, which yet is Wine; what it is to the unworthy Re-'ceiver, that is to him who abides not in God, is so far, I 'confess, from being expressible, that it is altogether uncon-'ceivable by me; and therefore in this case, I ought to take 'that word as spoke to me, Don't seek after things too high 'for thee, nor search out things too deep for thee.

This ſeems to be very full, and yet, *pag.* 182, he ſeems to believe with *Paſchaſius*, that it is the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, whoſoever he be that receives it. But after all, the Good man referrs himſelf to the Belief of St. *Chryſoſtom*, who calls the Sacrament a Spiritual Food, and to that of St. *Auſtin*, *Tr.* 61, & 62. *in Johannem, vid. pag.* 304.

Thus in his firſt *Eaſter*-Sermon, he ſuppoſeth, that the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt is not received by the Wicked, *p.* 310. and in his fourth Sermon on the ſame ſubject, he aſſerts the contrary, *pag.* 322.

Whatſoever may be his Opinion in this matter, in thoſe Writings I have before produc'd, he ſeems to have ſpoken more plainly in favour of the Real Change of the Euchariſt of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, in his Epiſtle publiſhed by *D' Achery*, in the 12 Tome of his *Spicilegium*; but at the ſame time he gives this advantage, that he furniſheth us with a new Defender of that figurative ſence in the words of the Euchariſt, for he clearly attributes to his Friend, to whom he wrote, that he took the words in no other ſence, than as they are underſtood by the Proteſtants; upon which 'tis natural to take notice of Two things, the firſt, That the Diſciples of *Paſchaſius* have had great trouble to oppoſe directly the Opinion of St. *Auſtin*, who lays it down alwaies, That only the Faithful receive the Body of Jeſus Chriſt. The other is, That *Gaufridus Vindocinenſis* is perhaps the firſt who taught clearly (about the year 1100) that the Wicked receive the Body of Chriſt as well as the Faithful: againſt the conſtant Doctrine of St. *Auſtin*, *Tract.* 26. *in Johan.*

Edit. Pariſ. p. 277.

We ought not to forget, that in his *Perpendicular Volume*, *pag.* 183, he attributes the force of the Conſecration to Prayer; which the Church of *Rome* at preſent condemns.

P. 258, 262, 305, 308, 312, 320, 330.

We may eaſily judge, that the Communion under both kinds was in vogue at that time; as appears from ſeveral places of his Works.

p. 261.

But we are to obſerve, concerning this matter, firſt, That he expreſly forbids private Maſſes.

p. 264, 282, 283.

Secondly, That they kept ſtill the Cuſtom, not to communicate on Faſt days, except in the Afternoon, becauſe the Communion broke the Faſt; ſo little were they of opinion

at

at that time, That the Substance of the Bread and Wine was lost and vanished by means of the Consecration.

Thirdly, That the custom of giving the Eucharist to *Laicks*, in order to carry it to the Sick, was not yet abolished, though it began then to be condemned. p. 260.

It is evident enough how much these Articles oppose the Belief of the Church of *Rome*. We may see, that the Church at that time did not take the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, since She believ'd that it could not be celebrated without Communicants. The Church did not believe it to be only an heap of Accidents, because She believ'd, that the taking of the Sacrament did break the Fast. The Church of *Rome* could not leave the Sacrament in the hands of *Laicks*, after She had once made it the Object of her Adoration.

But let us proceed to other Articles about the Sacraments: Seeing that *Ratherius* lays down eight deadly Sins, we may guess from thence, that he was not acquainted with the Seven Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*, which have a reference to the Seven Sins, as the Modern Divines of that Communion assure us.

True it is, that he speaks of anointing the Sick but as of an Unction which was administred before the Communion of dying men, which has been prudently altered in the *Pontificale Romanum*, since they have thought fit to own Extreme Unction for the last of their Sacraments. p. 260.

As to Baptism, and its necessity, it appears by his Synodical Epistle, that he was against having the Custom abrogated of Baptizing only on *Easterday* and *Whitsunday*, except in case of necessity, that is, danger of Death. p. 262.

As to the matter of Penance, he would have the Priests invite the People to it, and that they may impose Penances upon those who commit some secret Sins; but he reserves to himself the power to impose Penance upon publick Sinners; which shews that the ancient Discipline was yet in practice: And he would have the Priests of his Dioceſs to be furnished with a *Pœnitential*, that they might follow the Canons thereof; so far was he from owning them for Absolute Judges, who could pronounce without Appeal. p. 262, 264, 265.

He

He did indeed believe *Purgatory*, but after another manner than the Church of *Rome* doth; for he saith expressly, that it is only for slighter Sins; whereas, according to the Papists, it is also appointed for the Temporal Pain of Mortal Sins: *Purgatorii pœna non est statuta pro criminibus sed pro peccatis levioribus, quæ utiq; per lignum, fœnum & stipulam designantur*: 'The Punishment of Purgatory is not appointed for 'Crimes, but for lighter Sins, which are intimated by Wood, 'Hay and Stubble.

p. 290.

We shall now proceed to the examining of some other Points, the better to inform our selves of the State of this Church of *Italy*, during the Tenth Century.

First, They believed that all Bishops in general were St. *Peter's* Successors. *Ratherius* is very express in this case, *Petri omnes Episcopi vicem tenent in Ecclesiis*. 'All Bishops 'are *Peter's* Vicegerents in their Churches, & *pag.* 168, 169, 173. & 229.

p. 164.

Secondly, They did not believe that the Pope had power to remove Bishops from one Bishoprick to another. The Translation of *Ratherius* from the See of *Liege*, was done by order from the Emperor, and of a Council of *Italy*, assembled at *Verona*.

Pag. 171.

Thirdly, They were very sensible of the inconvenience of the Sovereignty which the Pope endeavoured to usurp over the Church. See what *Ratherius* speaks of it. *Si Papa sit nequam, perjurus, adulter, venator, ebriosus, quid fiet de querimoniis ad ipsum delatis? Ridebit querulos, favebit sibi similibus.* 'If the Pope should prove a wicked Man, perjur'd, an 'Adulterer, a Hunter, a Drunkard; what will become of the 'complaints made to him? He will laugh at those that 'complain, and favour those that are like himself.

Pag. 173.

Fourthly, They without fear laugh'd at the Pope's Excommunications, and his *Anathema's*, of which he began already to be very liberal. *Ratherius* gives us an instance of it in his Apologetick; *De quodam clerico venalem illam, ut dit Salustius, adiens urbem, pretio, ut omnia antiquitus, ibi emptas quasi Apostolicas deferens chartas Anathematis tam me, quam successores omnimodis meos mulctavit mucrone; ut quivis abhinc Episcoporum si de*

Pag. 231.

si de clericorum se infra mitteret rebus, perpetuo, ut ainut anathemate foret damnatus. 'Concerning one of the Clergy, who 'going to that Cry, where all things were to be sold, 'as *Saluſt* expreſſes it, and bringing along with him the 'Apoſtolical Letters, bought for Mony, as of old, he ſmote 'me, as well as all my Succeſſors, with the edge of the 'Anathematical Sword; ſo that any Biſhop from hence 'forward, that ſhall meddle with any matters concerning 'the Clergy, muſt expect to be condemned by a perpetual 'Anathema. We may ſee how he refutes this piece of folly.

Fifthly, They were yet in a doubt, whether the title of Univeral did of right belong to the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Veſtræ Paternitatis provolvens Genibus, Domine venerandiſſime Archipræſul, Archiepiſcope, &, ſi de ullo mortalium jure dici poſſit, Univerſalis Papa nominande.* 'Proſtrating my ſelf at the 'Knees of your Paternity, moſt Reverend Lord, Arch-'prelate, Archbiſhop, and if it may of Right be ſaid of 'any mortal, Univerſal Pope———. *Ratherius* being baniſhed from his Church, gives us a very ludicrous notion of it. *Ait, tædet me eſſe Univerſalem Epiſcopum, id eſt, Gyrovagum & ſine ſede.* 'It troubles me, ſaith he, to be an Uni-'verſal Biſhop, that is, a wanderer about, without a 'See.

Pag. 246.

Pag. 252.

Sixthly, He appealed indeed to the Pope, concerning the unjuſt oppreſſion he endur'd; but he appealed alſo at the ſame time to the Councils of *Gaul*, of *Italy* and of *Germany*.

Pag. 253.

Seventhly, He takes notice, that he did not go to *Rome* out of Devotion, becauſe it is ſaid, *John* 4. 21. *the hour cometh, when ye ſhall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jeruſalem*, &c. but that he might be preſent at the Synod.

Some other Points worth our obſerving are,

Firſt, He deplores the general contempt of the Canons of the Church, a neglect which reigned from the Pope, to the meaneſt of the People. *Luget generalem contemptum Canonum a Laico, ad Summum (pro nefas!) Pontificem.*

Pag. 168.

He

Pag. 188. He chargeth the *Italians* with being the moſt corrupt of all, by reaſon of their greater proneneſs to Debauchery and Vice; that the Doctors there neglected all Diſcipline, inſomuch as the Clergy did in nothing differ from the Laity, but in their habits.

Pag. 218. *Secondly*, He obſerves that moſt of the Clergy were either Sodomites or Adulterers. *Quam perdita tonſatorum Univerſitas tota, ſi nemo in eis qui non adulter aut ſit aut Arſenoquita.* How profligate is the whole crew of Shavelings, when there is none among them that is not either an Adulterer or a Sodomite?

Pag. 241. *Thirdly*, As for Simony, it was ſo common, that he writes to the Biſhop of *Parma*, to deſire him to conſer orders upon Children for Mony no more, as he was wont to

Pag. 249,250. do. *Manaſſes*, Biſhop of *Milan*, who had five Biſhopricks, ſold that of *Verona*, and turned out *Ratherius*.

Pag. 270. *Fourthly*, He takes notice of ſuch extreme ignorance in the Prieſts of his Dioceſs, that they could not ſo much as ſay the Apoſtles Creed. And he chargeth his Prieſts, in his Synodical Epiſtle, to be able to ſay it without Book, together with that of Saint *Athanaſius*.

Fifthly, He obſerves, that both Prieſts and People were Anthropomorphites.

pag. 289. *Sixthly*, He cannot diſſemble the way which ſome of theſe Prieſts took to deceive Souls, by maintaining that none that had been baptized could ever be damned.

Seventhly, Laſtly he exclaims, That Chriſtianity was periſht and gone. *Vera quo evaſiſti Chriſtianitas?* True Chriſtianity, whither art thou fled? And he declares, That his

Pag. 289. time was that of which the Apoſtle ſpoke when he ſaid, *That many ſhould depart from the Faith.*

This good *Ratherius* in truth had his ſhare of the Ignorance that reigned in his time, as well as of the Superſtition that had already ſeized upon many in *Italy*. Which ignorance of his appears,

1. In that he admits for true the falſe Decretals, which the Popes had foiſted in, to ſubject all the World to themſelves.

2. By

2. By his finding fault with the Ordination of those Persons who had been married more than once, as supposing they were forbid by the Apostle. Pag. 169.

3. By his lamenting the Liberty which was given to the Clergy to marry. Pag. 170, 171.

4. In that he joyns the married Bishops, with the most corrupt and profligate of that Order. Pag. 172.

5. By his charging the Clergy with a great crime, for having refused to obey the Edict of the Emperor, which condemn'd the marriage of Ecclesiasticks.

6. From his falsly pretending that marriage had been forbid to Ministers by the Third Canon of the Council of *Nice*; whereas they maintained that they ought to use Matrimony, to avoid falling into those enormous Crimes, which St. *Paul* hath set down in his First Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*. Pag. 217.

7. From his expelling the married Monks out of his Abby, and placing Canons in their place. Pag. 236.

8. From his prescribing some Fasts to a Woman that had married a Priest, without dissolving the marriage, or declaring it void.

9. From his commanding Laicks to abstain from their Wives and from Flesh Twenty eight days before *Advent*, and Twenty days before *Christmas*.

10. From his severely blaming those who instead of fasting forty days, fasted only twenty.

The second Author that can give us any information concerning the State of the Dioceſs of *Italy* is *Atto*, Bishop of *Vercil*; who, as *Ughellus* tells us, flourished about the middle of the Tenth Century. *D'Achery*, has published several of his Pieces in his *Spicilegium*, *Tom.* VIII.

We find in the Capitulary, which he addrest to the Priests of his Dioceſs, almost all borrowed from that of *Theodulphus*, who was an *Italian* born, that he charged them to learn *Athanasius* his Creed, as a short compendium of the Faith, upon pain of interdiction from Wine for forty days; and to explain the Apostles Creed to those that demanded Baptism. But doth not speak to them at all of other Doctrines taught at present, as another part of Religion. Cap. 4.

Cap. 7. He forbids the Celebration of Masses without any Communicants, and shews them that this is contrary to the Canon of the Liturgy.

Cap. 23. & 24. He very severely condemns the Custom of burying in Churches; as likewise that of selling Places to bury the Dead in: though this Custom was at first introduc'd by an Opinion, That the Dead received some help from the Prayers of their Relations.

Cap. 30. He absolutely forbids the Ordination of Priests without Title, which shews that he did not look upon the trade of Sacrificing the Body of Jesus Christ to be so necessary and authoriz'd, that for it he ought to dispense with the Canons, which are now laid aside, since the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass is come in request.

Cap. 57. He commands the Clergy to work with their hands, after reading and Prayer; which some ages after was condemned in the *Waldenses*; though therein he follows *Theodulphus* and the Rule of St. *Bennet*.

Cap. 58. He will not have any thing read in the Church, save the Books of the Old and New Testament; and permits the passions of the Martyrs to be read only on their Anniversaries.

Cap. 59. He condemns the Custom of making Baths of Holy Water, which was introduced into that Country.

Cap. 74, 75. He hath one Chapter about the case of the Eucharist that is fallen down, and concerning him that vomits again after three days; which plainly shews, that they supposed it to nourish really and truly, notwithstanding that it was Consecrated Bread.

Cap. 90. It appears evidently, that publick Penance had not yet given place to the practice of Confession to Priests, which has wholly abolished all the Discipline of the Church of *Rome*.

He makes an Extract of the Rule of St. *Bennet*, concerning the Moral part of the Gospel; to which there is no Protestant but would be very willing to subscribe, as containing nothing of the Spirit of Monkery or of Superstition.

He reduceth the matters of Faith, which Believers ought to know, to the Lord's Prayer, according to the Council of *Forojulio*, which I have already cited. Cap. 97.

He maintains, according to the Canons of the Church of *Rome*, That the Scriptures are the Foundation of Religion, and doth not admit of the writings of the Fathers, but with this Caution; *Try all things, hold fast that which is good:* And according to the Canon of *Gelasius*, he ranks several Books amongst the Apocryphal writings, from whence the Church of *Rome*, some Ages after, has borrowed divers Shreds to stuff out her Breviary, and their Lives of Saints. Cap. 100.

We may now take a view of his Doctrine in his Treatise of the Judgments of Bishops. He maintains, That the Church is founded on the Confession of the Apostolick Faith, and that she subsists by the Faith and Love of Jesus Christ, by the receiving of the Sacraments, and by the Observation of our Saviour's Precepts. All the rest of that Discourse, wherein he highly exalts the power of the Pope of *Rome*, is a plain sign that he was trepan'd into the Snare, which had been set 150 years before, by a suppositious obtrusion of the false Decretals of Antient Popes, the end of which was to appropriate the Cognizance of the Trials of Bishops to the Pope, under pretence of preventing their Oppression. In particular, he shews himself very angry against those who obliged the Bishops to terminate the quarrels they had with Laicks, by providing a Champion to fight it out for them. Pag. 45.

He pretends that the Scripture of the New Testament does absolutely forbid Christians to swear; which constitutes one of the Errors of the *Waldenses*. p. 50.

He maintains, according to the Doctrine of St. *Ambrose*, That it is not lawful for Bishops to take up Arms, no, not for the Church's Interest; which the Popes have practis'd but very badly. p. 55, & 56.

He seems to suppose, that the Order of Bishops, and that of Presbyters, were not two different Orders in St. *Paul*'s time, and that they were distinguished afterwards. p. 63.

p. 64. He asserts, That *Laicks* have Right to judge of the Behaviour of Bishops, as it is their Right to have a share in their Election.

He imploys a whole Treatise to confound the disorder which reigned at that time in the Election of Bishops, as having no regard either to their Charity or Faith, but to the nobleness of their Blood, and electing many that were yet meer Children.

Epist. 2. He declares in one of his Letters, that some Heresies were already crept into his Dioceſs, which he had already hinted in the 48. chap. of his Capitulary, and he seems to point at a Branch of the *Manichean* Heresie.

He shews, That in his Dioceſs they would not fast on *Saturdays*; which he finds fault with, notwithstanding the *Saturdays* Fast was not known in St. *Ambroſe*'s time, in the Dioceſs of *Milan*.

He quotes a Law of the *Lombards*, to shew, That the Marriage of a Godson with his Godmother was unlawful: and the definition he afterwards gives of Marriage, shews, that he knew nothing of its being a Sacrament.

He maintains, That the She-Priests, of whom mention is made in the Canons, were the Primitive Deaconesses, that they had power to teach in publick, and that formerly they were employed to baptize Maids or Women; which Priests had married Wives before they had received Orders, from whom they were to abstain afterwards.

Whoever will reflect upon what I have here said, and upon several other matters that might be observed, will easily judge, that both Truth and Piety began to decrease in this Dioceſs, and that Error and Superstition, by little and little, began to take their Places, in spight of the opposition of those whom God had raised up to stop their Progress: however, the Essentials of Religion still continued there, notwithstanding these growing Corruptions.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

An Enquiry into the Opinions of Gundulphus *and his Followers, before the Year* 1026.

D'*Achery* has publiſhed a Synod, which was held at *Arras* by *Gerard* Biſhop of *Cambray* and *Arras*, in the year of our Lord 1025, by which it doth appear, that *Gundulphus* had taught ſeveral Doctrines in *Italy*, which had been carried by his Diſciples into the Dioceſs of *Liege* and of *Cambray* in the Low Countries. This Synod having been held in the year 1025, we may eaſily judge that *Gundulphus* had a great number of Diſciples in *Italy*. The account *Gerard* gives to *Reginaldus* Biſhop of *Liege*, concerning the Examination of theſe *Italians*, takes notice, Firſt, That they had appeared before *Reginaldus*, who had examined them about their Opinions, and had ſent them back without condemning them. Secondly, That even then they imployed the Terror of Puniſhments, againſt thoſe who were ſuſpected of Hereſie, to which *Gerard* attributes the ſeeming Piety thoſe *Italians* made ſhew of: We may alſo gather this from *Glaber*, l. 4. c. 2. where he ſpeaks of a certain Hereſie diſcovered in *Italy*, and cruelly perſecuted by the Biſhops, and the Nobility of that Country. Thirdly, That they ſent their Diſciples up and down to multiply the number of their Followers, and that indeed they had withdrawn many from the Opinions of *Paſchaſius Rathertus*, which inſenſibly began to be eſtabliſhed. Fourthly, That *Gerard* did in vain make uſe of Violence to make them confeſs their Belief, and that he could not come to know it, but by thoſe who had been gained by them. Fifthly, That he only gives an account in part of their Opinions. What may be gathered from *Gerard's* Preface to *Reginaldus*, is this: T. 13. Spicil.

First,

First, They own themſelves to be the Diſciples of one *Gundulphus*, who had inſtructed them concerning the Evangelical and Apoſtolical Doctrine; That they received no other Doctrine, and that they practiſed the ſame *verbo & opere*, in word and deed.

But ſince it had been reported to *Gerard*, that they abhorred Baptiſm, that they rejected the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour, that they denied the uſe of Penance after Sin, that they made void the Church; that they deteſted lawful Marriages, that they owned no *Virtue* in the Holy Confeſſors, and that they pretended that the Apoſtles only, and Martyrs, were to be reverenced, we find, that being interrogated upon theſe Heads by *Gerard*; they anſwer diſtinctly as follows.

First, To that which the Biſhop told them, that Jeſus Chriſt had eſtabliſhed the neceſſity of *Baptiſm*, *John* 3. *Except a man be born again*, &c. they anſwer, *Lex & Diſciplina noſtra quam à magiſtro accepimus, nec Evangelicis decretis, nec Apoſtolicis ſanctionibus contraire videbitur, ſi quis eam diligenter velit intueri. Hac namq; hujuſmodi eſt, mundum relinquere, carnem à concupiſcentiis frenare, de laboribus manuum ſuarum victum parare, nulli læſionem quærere, Charitatem cunctis quos Zelus hujus noſtri propoſiti teneat, exhibere. Servatâ igitur hac juſtitiâ nullum opus eſſe Baptiſmi, prævaricatâ verò iſtâ, Baptiſmum ad nullam proficere ſalutem. Hæc eſt noſtra juſtificationis ſumma, ad quam nihil eſt quod Baptiſmi uſus ſuperaddere poſſit, cum omnis Apoſtolica & Evangelica inſtitutio hujuſmodi ſine claudatur. Si quis autem in Baptiſmate aliquod dicat latere ſacramentum, hoc tribus ex cauſis evacuatur: Una, quia vita reproba miniſtrorum, Baptizandi nullum poteſt prabere ſalutis Remedium. Altera quia quidquid vitiorum in fonte renuntiatur, poſtmodum in vitæ reſpectum. Tertia, quia ad Parvulum non volentem, neque currentem, fidei neſcium, ſuaque ſalutis atque utilitatis ignarum, in quem nulla Regenerationis petitio, nulla fidei poteſt inſſe confeſſio, aliena voluntas, aliena fides, aliena confeſſio nequaquam pertinere videtur.* 'The Law and Diſcipline we have received from our Maſter, will not appear contrary either 'to the Goſpel Decrees or Apoſtolical Inſtitutions, if 'carefully look'd into. This Diſcipline conſiſts in leaving 'the

'the World, in bridling carnal concupiſcence, in providing 'a livelihood by the labour of our hands, in hurting no 'body, and affording our Charity to all, who are zealous 'in the proſecution of this our Deſign. Now if this 'Righteouſneſs be obſerved there will be no need of Bap'tiſm; and if broken, Baptiſm cannot avail to Salvation. 'This is the ſumm of our Juſtification, to which the uſe 'of Baptiſm can ſuperadd nothing, ſince this is the end 'of all Apoſtolical and Evangelical Inſtitutions. But if 'any ſhall ſay, That ſome Sacrament lies hid in Baptiſm, 'the force of that is taken off by theſe Three Cauſes; 'The Firſt is, becauſe the Reprobate Life of Miniſters can 'afford no ſaving Remedy to the Perſons to be Baptized. 'The Second, becauſe whatſoever ſins are renounced at the 'Font, are afterwards taken up again in life and practice. 'The Third, becauſe a ſtrange Will, a ſtrange Faith and 'a ſtrange Confeſſion do not ſeem to belong to, or be 'of any advantage to a little Child, who neither wills 'nor runs, who knows nothing of Faith, and is altogether 'ignorant of his own Good and Salvation, in whoſe there 'can be no deſire of Regeneration, and from whom no 'confeſſion of Faith can be expected.

It appears by the Biſhop's Anſwer, wherein there are ſome good Arguments to eſtabliſh the neceſſity of Baptiſm, that theſe *Italians* were fallen upon theſe Opinions, to put themſelves at a greater diſtance from the Maxims of their Prieſts, which I have taken notice of, where I mention the Belief of *Ratherius*. There is one thing obſervable about their other Reaſons, which is, That the Biſhop objects to them, in order to perſwade them of the neceſſity of Baptiſm, the Cuſtom of waſhing one anothers Feet, which they called *Mandatum*; whence it is eaſie to judge, that they lookt upon Baptiſm only as a Myſtical Ceremony, the end of which was, to expreſs the Engagement of him who is baptized, and the Vow he makes to live holily; which made them not to ſet any great value upon it, and to oppoſe themſelves againſt the notion of the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm, without which, the Prieſts of thoſe times believed, there was no attaining to Salvation; as well

as

as against the pretended efficacy of Baptiſm, ſo that whoſoever received it, could not fail of Salvation

The Second Head, upon which *Gerard* examined them, was the Article of the Carnal preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt; he refutes their Objections, which he makes to himſelf. The one is, That the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is in Heaven, ſince his Aſcenſion. The other, that the Bodily eating of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, cannot profit, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt himſelf hath declared in the Sixth of St. *John*, *That the fleſh profiteth nothing*. The Third is, That the Body of Jeſus Chriſt would no longer continue to be one entire Body, being divided through ſo many places, and found in ſo many Churches.

The chief Heads of his Anſwers to theſe Objections are made up of Apparitions, which he had extracted out of *Paſchaſius*'s Book; which plainly ſhews, That the *Italians* did not reject the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, but the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius*, which began then to be eſtabliſhed, though it met with great Contradictions in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, where Abbot *Gezo* had revived it, by publiſhing a Book upon that Subject; whereof *Mabillon* has given us an Extract, in his *Iter Italicum*.

The third Article concerns the Conſecration of Churches; it appears, that they *believed nothing of* theſe Sanctifications, which were attributed to ſacred Edifices and Altars; but pretended that the Prayers they made in the Houſes, were no leſs agreeable to God, than if they had been made in the Churches. The reaſon of this ſhieneſs they expreſt to Churches is evident, from their reproaching the Idolatry that was practiſed in them in point of Images and other matters.

The fourth is about the Altar to which they refuſed to bow or ſhew any reverence, as the practice was then, after it was conſecrated with Holy Oyle; which is an evident ſign that the thing they ſtruck at was theſe Conſecrations, which they accuſed as ſuperſtitious; ſo far were they from looking upon them as a juſt motive to exhibit any honour or reſpect to the material things that had received them.

The

The Fifth is of the ſame kind concerning thoſe cenſings, which were then uſed in imitation of the Ceremonies of the *Moſaical* Law; the Unction with Oyle practiſed upon thoſe that were poſſeſt, ſick Perſons and *Catechumeni*, and the anointing of Biſhops and Prieſts at their Conſecration.

The Sixth is about Bells, they finding fault with the virtue which was attributed to their ſound, *viz.* Of driving away Tempeſts, and the Devil's power.

The Seventh Article concerns the different Orders of Miniſters; theſe *Italians* being accuſed of rejecting them, becauſe they gave the Impoſition of Hands in private, and blamed the Miniſtry, ſuch as it was received in the Weſtern Church; and that by this means they took upon them Eccleſiaſtical Functions, being themſelves Secular Perſons.

The Eighth is about Burial in conſecrated places, which theſe *Italians* lookt upon only as an effect of the Covetouſneſs of Prieſts, who could imagine no other advantage in being buried in Holy places, but that of ſelling them the dearer to the People, whom they had abuſed by this notion of holineſs inherent in one place more than another.

The Ninth reſpects Penance after Baptiſm; which, according to *Gerard*'s Accuſation of them, they rejected, which ſeems to agree with the Opinion of the *Novatians*; but we may eaſily judge that the thing they chiefly ſtruck at, were thoſe Penal works which began then to be impoſed, as in order to ſatisfie the Divine Juſtice.

This appears more clearly from the Tenth Article, which ſhews that what they ſtruck at were Cuſtoms and Uſages of the Church of *Rome*. Thus he accuſes them of aſſerting, That Penance was of no uſe after Death; whereas *Gerard* maintains, That the works of the living, Alms, Maſſes, and the ſatisfactions which perſons impoſed upon themſelves for the Dead, were indeed of great efficacy, for the Salvation of the deceaſed. It appears clearly, from the Proofs of *Gerard*, That they ſtruck at the Doctrine of Purgatory, and thoſe practices which this Belief had introduced into the Church.

The Eleventh Article accuſeth them for looking upon lawful marriage as an Abomination, and a ſtate wherein it was impoſſible to be ſaved.

The Twelfth Article accuſeth them for refuſing to give any Veneration to Confeſſors, and reſerving it only for Apoſtles and Martyrs; and for maintaining, that there was no virtue in the dead Bodies of Saints after they are once returned to Duſt; which *Gerard* refutes, by an examination of the miracles, performed by every Biſhop of his Dioceſs, before the People brought to the Tombs the marks of their Veneration of any Confeſſors.

The Thirteenth Article accuſeth them for finding fault with the ſinging of Pſalms, which was then received in the Church, under a pretence that thoſe that ſo made uſe of them, were thereby obliged ſometimes to curſe themſelves, by their repeating the Imprecations contained in the ſaid Pſalms.

The Fourteenth Article was about their refuſing to reverence the Croſs, maintaining that it had no virtue at all, as being only a work of Mens Hands.

The Fifteenth Article concerned the Image of our Saviour on the Croſs, that of the Bleſſed Virgin, and thoſe of the Saints and Angels, *&c.* which they refuſed to worſhip.

The Sixteenth reſpects the obedience which they were ſaid to refuſe to the Miniſters of the Church, to Biſhops, Archdeacons, Deans and *Præpoſiti*, the Model of which Government they pretended to derive from the Angelical Hierarchy treated of by *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*.

The Seventeenth concerns the Righteouſneſs they arrogated to themſelves, becauſe of their good Works, as if they had renewed the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, to which *Gerard* oppoſeth the Notions of St. *Auſtin*, and the neceſſity of adhering to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, as being that which St. *Peter* preached at *Rome*, and which his Succeſſors have propagated throughout all the Weſt.

These are the Opinions which *Gerard* made these *Italians* abjure; who, as the Acts of the Synod tell us, were convinced and confounded, by the refutation he had made of their errors. The Acts of the Synod contain the abjuration of these Opinions. They acquaint us moreover, that these *Italians*, pretending not to understand the Contents of this Excommunication, because it was writ in *Latine*, it was explained to them in *Italian*, and they were made to sign it, and to set a sign of the Cross before their Names.

It is worth our observing,

First, That what they were made to own, was not subscribed by them, till after they had been three days in Prison; having been committed by order of the Bishop.

Secondly, That all this Confession was extorted by fear of punishment, wherewith they had been threatned at *Liege*, and afterwards at *Arras*.

Thirdly, That it seems not altogether improbable, that they differed about some of these Opinions amongst themselves, as may be very naturally gathered from the History of the following Ages, and yet they are all involved in the same Excommunication: Thus without fear did they treat People, who did not understand *Latine*, and who were obliged to express their mind by Interpreters.

Fourthly, That they were not made to confess any thing that savours of *Manicheism*, except the matter of Marriage.

Fifthly, That the Errors whereof they were accused, seem to take their Birth from an Inclination very natural to the mind of Man, who is very prone to cast himself upon the opposite extremity, whilest he endeavours to separate himself from errors. St. *Cyprian* rebaptized those who had been baptized by Hereticks; *Stephen* received the Baptism of all Hereticks without distinction. Several Dioceses were divided amongst themselves, by reason of these contrary practices above Eighty Years, until the convening of the First Council of *Arles*, which yet was not able wholly to compose this difference. *Gun-*

dulphus ſeeing them aſſert, That whoſoever was baptized could never be damned, falls to an indifference for Baptiſm, thinking it ſufficient to keep to the eſſentials of that Sacrament. And the ſame we are to ſuppoſe of their Anabaptiſm, and ſome other of their Articles.

Sixthly, That we find in this their Doctrine the ſubſtance of thoſe Articles, which the *Waldenſes* have condemned in the Faith and Worſhip of the Church of *Rome*.

Seventhly, And as to the Imputation of their finding fault with the Hierarchy of the Church, this proceeded indeed from nothing elſe, but from the abuſe which was then ſo cuſtomary in the Weſtern Churches, and of *Italy* in particular, as I have juſt now made out concerning the Tenth Century; and the multiplication of Eccleſiaſtical Offices, into ſo many different Orders, appeared to them to be very oppoſite to the Inſtitutions of the Primitive Church.

This being laid down, I ſay we have already found a Body of Men in *Italy*, before the Year 1026. who believed contrary to the Opinions of the Church of *Rome*, and who highly condemned their errors; a Body of Men which ſent its Members about into divers places, to oppoſe themſelves to the Superſtitions, that reigned throughout all the Weſt.

I ſhall, in the Sequel of this Diſcourſe, ſhew the reaſon why they were accuſed of being meer Seculars, and ſhall make it appear, that at the bottom this was nothing elſe but a pure Calumny, founded upon an unjuſt prejudice.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Reflections upon ſome Practices of the Churches of the Dioceſs of Italy.

WHAT I have already repreſented in the foregoing Chapters, makes it evident, as far as can be deſired, that the Dioceſs of *Italy* in Faith as well as Worſhip had the purity neceſſary to conſtitute a true Chriſtian Church. I own that we find in it ſome errors and ſome ſuperſtitions; the account I have already given being a full proof thereof. But I have farther to obſerve,

Firſt, That their Liturgy contains nothing that favours theſe Errors or Superſtitions; now we know, that we ought to judge of a Church, by the publick writings of Religion.

Secondly, That though ſeveral private Men, or even ſome of the Clergy, were involved in theſe Errors or Superſtitions, this muſt not be made uſe of to the prejudice of the whole Dioceſs.

Thirdly, We find that at that very time the ableſt and learnedeſt Men amongſt them, did vigorouſly ſet themſelves againſt theſe Errors and theſe Superſtitions of a blind People, and an ignorant Clergy.

Theſe general Remarks ought in particular to be applied to theſe following Articles. The 1. is, Prayer for the Dead. 2. Doting on the Reliques of Saints. 3. The Cuſtom of praying to Saints. 4. The too rigorous injunction of Faſts, fixed to certain days. 5. The too great eſteem they had of the Celibacy impoſed upon Eccleſiaſticks. Theſe are the moſt ancient of their Superſtitions. We find alſo, that in proceſs of time the uſe of Images, and ſome groſs notions of the carnal preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Sacrament, were introduced into this Dioceſs.

I own

I own that Prayer for the Dead was uſed in this Diocеſs even before the Fourth Century: but withal I find it was practiſed there under another notion, than it is in the Church of *Rome*, which ſince *Gregory* I. found the belief of it wholly upon the Doctrine of Purgatory, unknown to all the Churches of the Eaſt.

Firſt, They prayed to God in general, That he would be pleaſed to make thoſe partakers of the Reſurrection whom he had taken out of this World, which we approve of, and which we do as often, as by the Kingdom of God, the coming of which we pray for, we underſtand the Kingdom of Glory, which is to deſtroy Death, the laſt Enemy of Believers.

Secondly, They begged of God another kind of Reſurrection, which they conceived that God had promiſed to ſome Believers, who particularly had the priviledge of being admitted into the Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt upon Earth. This was nothing elſe but a conſequence of the Opinion of the moſt ancient Chriſtians concerning the *Millennium*.

Thirdly, They joyned to this, the notion of the Deliverance from the Fire of the laſt Judgment, through which many of the Ancients were of Opinion that all Believers, the Bleſſed Virgin and Apoſtles not excepted, were to paſs. The ſtate of Souls before the Reſurrection being very uncertain in ancient times, and the Fathers taking unto themſelves the Liberty to philoſophiſe upon that Subject, in a very different manner, as the Learned of the Romiſh Church do confeſs: Theſe things have given occaſion to the riſe of Prayers for the Dead, and though their Opinions in this matter have been very different; yet they are all of them furniſhed with eſſential marks to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, in reſpect of their Opinions; as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* differ much in regard of their Opinions from the words of the Ancients which they make uſe of on this occaſion, and which are, for the moſt part, of a conſiderable antiquity.

I own

I own likewiſe, that the Veneration of Reliques appeared in this Dioceſs, from before the end of the Fourth Century, and ſince that, by little and little, got ſtrength there, as it is cuſtomary for humane Inventions to attain to their full growth by degrees. The Piety of the Primitive Chriſtians contented themſelves with burying the Bodies of Believers and Martyrs, and at their Interment ſolemnly bleſſed God that he had taken them to his Peace and Refreſhment. When the Church found themſelves under Perſecution, they met together in the Church-yards, or Burying-places; which gave occaſion to the Paſtors to diſcourſe to the Faithful, concerning the Conſtancy of the Martyrs; afterwards they celebrated the Euchariſt upon their very Tombs: And ſome time after, towards the end of the Fourth Century, they brought in a Cuſtom, not to conſecrate any Church, without putting firſt ſome Reliques of Martyrs under the Altar. This is what we find was practis'd by St. *Ambroſe*, with ſo much pomp, in reference to the Reliques of St. *Gervaſius* and St. *Protaſius*, and which he believ'd founded upon a Revelation. In proceſs of time, they took care to fill the Churches with the Bodies of Martyrs, thoſe of whom no Reliques were to be found, being in a manner quite forgot. They followed herein a Pagan Opinion, which ſuppoſeth the Souls of the deceaſed to be tied to their Graves. They took occaſion to conſider the Prayers made to God, in the preſence of theſe Tombs, as being made in the Communion of the Martyrs there preſent. They wiſhed that theſe Believers, being delivered from Temptations, might intercede, together with them, by an act of their firſt Charity: and ſo, by little and little, they began to addreſs their Prayers to them themſelves. Matters ſtood thus, when the famous Biſhop of *Turin* ſet himſelf againſt theſe Innovations with a great deal of vigor and zeal, founded upon the Doctrine of Scripture, and upon the Opinions of St. *Auſtin*.

As for what concerns their Faſts, I do own, That beſides that Faſt, which was anciently obſerved before *Eaſter*, from the Fourth Century, there have been ſome other Faſts fix'd to certain daies, as were thoſe that were kept on the ſame account

count with the former, for the solemn Baptism of the *Catechumeni*; those which accompanied the ordination of the Ministers of the Church, and some others: But, First, we are to observe, That the Church in those times did not make a meritorious and satisfactory work of Fasting, as it has been made some Ages since. Secondly, We cannot deny but that they were kept then in good earnest, they consisting in a total abstinence from eating or drinking; whereas at present they consist only in a distinction of Meats. Thirdly, That after all that can be said, the Church then consider'd Fasting only as an indifferent action, which was to be back'd and seconded by the motion of a true contrition and humility, without which it could not be well pleasing to God; which is quite contrary to what has been conceiv'd of it in these later times.

We cannot deny, but that a single State was observ'd by the Clergy of *Milan*, in the time of St. *Ambrose*; this appears from his first Book of Offices, *chap.* 50, where he expressly tells us, that those to whom he speaks, had received orders, being *alieni ab ipso consortio conjugali, Strangers to conjugal fellowship.* But we are to take notice, first, that in the same place he owns, That in most other places of less renown, the Priests and Bishops were married and had Children. Secondly, That they maintain'd this Custom in imitation of the Priests under the Law, who were not bound to forbear the company of their Wives, save only during the time of their Ministry. Thirdly, That they maintain'd, that the People of old were also oblig'd to abstain from their Wives for some few daies, in order to their partaking of the Sacrifices. The words of St. *Ambrose* on this occasion are these: *Quod eo non præterii, quia in plerisq; abditioribus locis, cum Ministerium gererent, vel etiam sacerdotium, filios susceperunt, & id tanquam usu veteri defendunt, quando per intervalla dierum sacrificium offerebatur: & tamen castigabatur etiam populus per biduum vel triduum, ut ad sacrificium purus accederet, ut in veteri Testamento legimus, & lavabat vestimenta sua. Si in figura tanta observantia, quanta in veritate?* 'Which therefore I did not pass by, because in more retired places, those that discharged the Office of *Levites*

'or

'or *Prieſts*, did beget Children; and this they maintain 'from what was in uſe under the old Law, when they 'offer'd Sacrifices with ſome intervening diſtance of time; 'and yet even the People themſelves were to uſe Abſti-'nence for two or three daies, that they might with the 'greater Purity come to the Sacrifice, according as we read 'in the Old Teſtament, and to waſh their Garments. If 'ſo ſtrict an obſervance were us'd in the Figure, how much 'more in the Truth it ſelf?

Whence it appears, firſt, That the greater part of the Clergy of the Dioceſs of *Milan*, were not bound to obſerve the Law of *Cœlibacy*, which *Paphnutius* had hindered the Council of *Nice* from impoſing upon the Biſhops and other Miniſters. Secondly, That though the Clergy of *Milan* lived in a ſingle ſtate, yet this was not by virtue of any Law, but of their own choice, and without any neceſſity. Thirdly, That the cauſe of St. *Ambroſe*'s ſo highly recommending the Cœlibacy of Miniſters, was the high eſteem he had for the ſingle ſtate. Fourthly, That it was a groſs Impoſture of *Petrus Damianus*, to maintain, as he did before the Clergy of *Milan*, That St. *Ambroſe* not being able to reduce his Clergy to a ſingle ſtate, had been obliged to implore the aſſiſtance of *Syricius*, to bring it about, and that he had declared he would follow the Church of *Rome* in that particular, as being his Miſtreſs. I know very well that he cites for this, the Book *de ſacerdotali dignitate*; which he attributes to St. *Ambroſe*, but with ſo little juſtice, that that alone is ſufficient to lay open the Impudence wherewith he abuſed the Credulity of the People of *Milan*.

This we may clearly gather from his 82 Epiſtle written to the Church of *Verceil*, where after having given the ſence of the words of St. *Paul*, which concern the Virtues of Miniſters, he adds, *Hæc poſui quæ cavenda acceperim. Virtutum autem magiſter Apoſtolus eſt, qui cum patientia redarguendos docet contradicentes qui unius uxoris virum præcipiat eſſe, non quo exſortem excludat conjugii, nam hoc ſupra legem præcepti eſt, ſed ut conjugali caſtimoniâ ſervet ablutionis ſuæ gratiam. Neq; iterum ut filios creare Apoſtolicâ invitetur auctoritate, habentem enim dixit filios, non facientem.* 'I have here ſet down what I underſtand

'ought to be avoided. Now the Apoſtle is a Maſter of 'Virtue, who teacheth, that Gainſayers ought to be repro-'ved with Patience, who commands a Presbyter to be Huſ-'band of one Wife, not as if he would thereby exclude 'thoſe that live in a ſingle ſtate; for that is ſomething above 'the Command of the Law: but that in conjugal Chaſtity 'he might preſerve the Grace received in Baptiſm; nor, 'as if thereby the Apoſtle would invite him by his Authority 'to beget Children, for the words of the Apoſtle are, *having* 'Children, not *begetting* them. Which expreſly proves, firſt, That the Biſhop or Prieſt, who continues with his Wife in the Conjugal Band, does not therefore ceaſe to keep his Baptiſmal Purity. Secondly, That according to him, the Apoſtle did no more deny Biſhops the liberty of marrying, than he granted it to them.

'Tis difficult to determine what were the Opinions of *Servatianus* and *Barbatianus*, of whom St. *Ambroſe* makes mention in that 82 Epiſtle. He tells us, that they came out of the Monaſtery of *Milan*, whence they betook themſelves to *Verceil*; he accuſeth them for aſſerting, That Virginity and Faſting did not deſerve any greater praiſe than the ſtate of Marriage, and the ordinary way of living. He aggravates this Indictment, by accuſing them of permitting Fornication, and aſſerting it not to be inferiour to the ſtate of Virginity or Lawful Marriage; whereupon he endeavours to prove the contrary, as being the Doctrine of the Church, and of the Scripture.

But in all this we may perceive ſomething of immoderate zeal, wherewith the love of *Cœlibacy* is apt to inſpire thoſe that maintain it. I will not accuſe St. *Ambroſe* for imitating the Extravagance of *Syricius*, in his Epiſtle to *Himerius* Biſhop of *Tarragon*, writ in 385, where he makes uſe of theſe words of St. *Paul*, *Thoſe who are in the Fleſh cannot pleaſe God*. As if all married People were in the Fleſh, according to the Apoſtle's meaning. But I cannot avoid obſerving, firſt, That St. *Ambroſe* ſeems to have imputed to *Servatianus* and *Barbatianus*, as their true Opinions, the conſequences which he himſelf had drawn from them, this being a method which an ungovern'd zeal does often put men upon,

upon, againſt thoſe whom they believe to be out of the way. Secondly, I ſay, that if the Caſe were otherwiſe, St. *Ambroſe* would ſcarce have been excuſable, for having acted ſo mildly againſt *Servatianus* and *Barbatianus*. How could he have done leſs than excommunicate them, and repreſent them to the Church of *Verceil*, as ſuch who ought to be excommunicated, for oppoſing the Principles of Chriſtianity, or as thoſe who ought to be rejected, for having been juſtly excommunicated at *Milan*. Indeed, whoſoever ſhall be pleaſed to make an unprejudiced reflection upon this Hiſtory, will hardly be able to perſwade themſelves otherwiſe, but that there is a great deal ſaid only to aggravate, in this Diſcourſe of St. *Ambroſe*; but at the ſame time, whatſoever he might have alledg'd, they will conceive, that theſe *Monks* were offended to ſee men begin to ſet too high an eſteem upon the ſtate of Virginity and Abſtinence, and that this had oblig'd them to ſpeak of them, with a kind of undervaluing and indifference, and to oppoſe themſelves againſt the prejudice that was then beginning to take root and be eſtabliſhed.

I ſay, that this Prejudice began then to be eſtabliſhed; for we find that the Council of *Turin*, celebrated a little after St. *Ambroſe*'s Death, doth abſolutely forbid the promoting of a married Deacon to the Prieſtly Office, or a married Prieſt to that of a Biſhop. True it is, that it ſeems that this Canon was not exactly obſerved, for we find ſeveral Examples of Prieſts and Biſhops, who probably had paſt through theſe firſt Orders, their Marriage proving no obſtacle to their promotion.

However it be, in proceſs of time, this rigor, which concern'd only the Clergy, was ſlackened in this Dioceſs; as I have made it appear. As alſo there happened no conſiderable change, till about the Tenth Century, when the barbarous Nations having overwhelmed that Dioceſs, as well as the greateſt part of the *Weſt*, the Biſhops were found to be ſtupid enough, to admit the falſe Decretals of the Pope, which ſome Impoſtor had publiſhed as a means to overthrow the ancient Diſcipline, and to ſubject the *Weſt* to the Romiſh See. In the time of *Alexander* II. and *Gre-*

gory VII, who could afford no better names to married Prieſts than that of *Nicolaitans*, *Servatianus* and *Barbatianus* would have been handled quite after another manner than they were by St. *Ambroſe*; which makes it evident enough, what the Opinion of the Church was at the time when this queſtion firſt appeared. 'Tis well known, that in ſucceeding times the Monks that had broken their vows and renounced their Oath, were obliged to do Penance; but we find nothing like this in St. *Ambroſe*'s time. The reaſon is, becauſe a Convent at that time was a matter of choice, which might be quitted without any other puniſhment, but the imputation of Imprudence, for not having ſufficiently conſider'd fully of that kind of life, before they engaged themſelves therein.

Furthermore 'tis good to obſerve, that the raſhneſs and imprudence of thoſe, who thus quitted this ſtate, ſeem'd the leſs pardonable, becauſe they did not admit Perſons to ſacred Orders that were very young, as we do now, but only men of an age ſufficient to know their own Conſtitution, and to know whether they were able to obſerve that kind of life which they voluntarily had taken upon them.

But what I have already obſerved may ſuffice to make it evident, that the ſtate of Religion in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, was not ſo far corrupted, but that we may own it to be a Church pure enough, and which, in reſpect of the moſt underſtanding of its Members, and that in publick too, had preſerved the true Faith and the true Worſhip which the Chriſtian Religion preſcribes to us.

Our buſineſs at preſent is to ſhew, that this Church was independent on the Power of the Pope of *Rome*; after which, we ſhall conſider its ſeparation from the Pope, when he endeavoured to ſubject it to his *Authority*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

That the Dioceſs of Italy *was an Independent Dioceſs, till after the midſt of the Eleventh Century.*

IN order to the thorow eſtabliſhing of this truth I intend to make it appear, that this is not only certain with reſpect to thoſe times, when the Popes were not very conſiderable, but alſo with reſpect to that time, when the Popes began to liſt up themſelves by the favour of *Gratian*, and after him of *Valentinian* III.

To this purpoſe it will be of uſe, to ſet forth as well the conſtitution of the Church, as the manner in which the Dioceſs of *Milan* did continue independent until the midſt of the Eleventh Century, at which time the *Waldenſes* were obliged more openly to teſtifie their averſion for the Church of *Rome*, as an Antichriſtian Church. It will be eaſie enough for me to perform what I have propoſed to my ſelf, in following the Hiſtory of the Church.

Before the Council of *Nice*, we find the Dioceſs of *Italy* very diſtinct from that of *Rome* which contained the ſuburbicary Churches: Of this we have two unqueſtionable proofs; the one of which we find in the caſe of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, where the Emperor *Aurelian* diſtinguiſheth the Biſhops of *Italy*, from thoſe of *Rome*, by his referring equally to them the deciſion of *Samoſatenus*'s Opinions, whether they were to be lookt upon as Orthodox or not. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 30.*

The other we meet with in the buſineſs of the Donatiſts, where *Conſtantine*, to put an end to the differences which divided the *African* Churches, appointed them Judges as well from *Rome* as from *Italy*: *Marocles*, Biſhop of *Milan*, as Head of his Dioceſs being nominated by the Emperor, as well as *Melchiades*. *Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 10. c. 5. Optat. l. 1. Cont. Parm.*

The

The Council of *Nice* confirmed this ancient cuſtom of the Metropolitans, who had enjoyed the Right of convening the Synods of their Dioceſs, and ordaining the Biſhops belonging to the ſame. This we ſee in the Sixth Canon: Each Dioceſs then formed a Council, which was called by the Metropolitan. Every Metropolitan ordered the Affairs of his Dioceſs, all matters were regulated by this Council, and there was no appeal from their Judgments. So that the Canon of the Council of *Nice*, ſerved inſtead of a Law as well in the Eaſt as the Weſt, and which might have ſerved ſo ſtill, if the ambition of the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* and of *Rome* had not overthrown this ſo wiſe a Regulation. *Memnon*, Biſhop of *Epheſus*, maintains, that this Canon did alſo conſtitute every Dioceſs ſo far independent on any of its Neighbours, that they could not take any cognizance of matters that were without their limits. This we find in the Acts of the Council of *Epheſus*.

We find that ſince that time, the thing continued on the ſame foot: many proofs might be given of it, but I ſhall content my ſelf with theſe following,

1. St. *Athanaſius* diſtinguiſheth *Milan* and *Rome* as two independent Churches.

2. The Election of St. *Ambroſe* is related to us by *Theodoret*, *Lib.* 4. *cap.* 5, 6. as done without any conſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*, which could not have been ſo, had he been the Patriarch of *Italy*.

Sulpit Sev. l. 2. Hiſt. The buſineſs of the *Priſcillianiſts*, who had recourſe to St. *Ambroſe* as well as to *Damaſus*, after that they had been rejected by the *Spaniſh* Biſhops at *Caſaraugusta*, is a certain proof hereof.

If we read the Hiſtory of the following Centuries, we ſhall not find that ever any Biſhops of *Italy* were ordained by the Popes, or were ſubject to their Councils till the Eleventh Century.

We find that the Council of *Italy*, in which St. *Ambroſe* preſided, approve in their Letter ſent to *Theodoſius*, the proceedings about the Election of *Maximus*, in oppoſition to the Opinion of *Damaſus* and his Council; ſo far

far were they from depending on the Pope as their Patriarch.

We find the same thing also acknowledged by those of *Africa*, who sent Legats as well to the Bishop of *Milan*, as to the Bishop of *Rome*. We find the same thing in the Year 431. *Theodoret* addressing himself to the Bishops of *Milan*, *Aquileia* and *Ravenna*, against the Chapters of *Cyril*, which Pope *Celestine* had approved. *Can.* 57. & 58. *Baron. An.* 431. §. 182.

We find in the Year 451. Pope *Leo* I. so fully owning this truth, that he writes to the Bishop of *Milan*, that he would be pleased to approve in his Synod, the Letter which the said Pope wrote to *Flavianus*, upon the Incarnation of the Word, against the Errors of *Eutyches*. We find *Flavianus* appealing to the Pope and the Bishop of *Milan* by name, as well as to the rest of the Western Metropolitans.

We find in the Year 1556. that the Diocess of *Milan* and its Bishops, stood resolutely to the Party that rejected the Fifth General Council, and though Pope *Pelagius* strongly sollicited *Narses*, to reduce them to his Opinion by Violence, yet he could never obtain his desire; as may be seen by St. *Gregory*'s Epistles: and the Church of *Aquileia* and some others of *Italy*, above an hundred Years after, had no Communion with the Church of *Rome*, as *Baronius* himself ingenuously confesseth.

We find in the Year 679. a Council of *Italy* assembled upon occasion of the *Monothelites*, wherein the Bishops of this Diocess alone writ to *Constantine* the Emperor, which sheweth their independence on the Pope, who wrote also in particular with his Council.

And last of all we do not find that since the Seventh Century, the Church of *Rome* has had that Authority over the Diocess of *Italy*, which she arrogated to her self over other Churches, where she had already gained some Preeminence by means of her Vicars.

We

Cap. 3. Tit. 7. We have an unqueſtionable proof of what I here alledge in the *Diurnus Romanus*. All the Biſhops that belonged to the Pope's Juriſdiction, by reaſon of their being in his Dioceſs, were obliged to ſwear at their Ordination, that they would follow the Rites and the Divine Service of the Church of *Rome*: now we know that the Church of *Milan* had its own peculiar Liturgy, called the *Ambroſian*. It is true, they pretend, that after *Charles* the Great had made himſelf Maſter of the Kingdom of the *Lombards*, he endeavoured to aboliſh the ſame, and ſome think it received a great change at that time; but this is only conjecture without ground; for excepting ſome ſlight Alterations cauſed by time, at a juncture when Popery had well nigh got the Maſtery there, that Liturgy continued much the ſame as it was before.

We find the ſame Independence of the Church of *Milan*, in the Ninth and Tenth Century acknowledged by *Ughellus* in the Life of *Angilbertus*. *Angilbertus Puſtrella ejuſdem nominis ſuperiori ſucceſſit* 827. *Hic ille Angilbertus eſt, quem tantæ dignitatis corrupit fœlicitas; cum aliquamdin moderatione antea uſus, prudenter Mediolanenſem adminiſtraſſet Eccleſiam; ſuffultus enim* (*ut quidam narrant*) *Magni Caroli privilegiis & gratiis, charuſque Ludovico Pio Imperatori, Lotharioque ejuſdem filio, à Romana Eccleſia ita defecit, ut per inauditam ſuperbiam, cum Romano Pontifice de poteſtate, deque dignitate decertare non verecundaretur. Peſſimum exemplum ita ad ſucceſſores pertranſiit, ut per ducentos ipſos annos, ea contumacia illos abduxerit infeceritque.* 'Angilbertus Puſtrella ſucceeded 'his Predeceſſor, of the ſame name, in the Year 827. 'This is that *Angilbert*, whom the ſplendor of ſo high a Dig- 'nity corrupted, after having uſed moderation for ſome 'time, he had prudently governed that Church. For be- 'ing upheld (as ſome tell us) by the Priviledges and 'Favours of *Charles* the Great, and being dear to the 'Emperor *Ludovicus Pius* and *Lotharius* his Son, he made 'a defection from the *Roman* Church, as not being aſhamed 'to contend with the Pope of *Rome* about Power and 'Dignity. This bad example of his paſt over to his Suc- 'ceſſor,

T. 4. Ital. Sacr. p. 3.

'ceſſor: ſo that for two hundred Years together they 'were led aſtray and infected by this Contumacy.

We are not to admit that which *Ughellus* would fain inſinuate, that this was a rebelling againſt his Patriarch. This is a meer illuſion. It was only a reſiſtance of the Enterpriſes of the Popes, who being encouraged by the eaſineſs and ignorance of divers Weſtern Prelates, did boldly invade thoſe Rights, which did not at all belong unto them. For we find that Eight Years after his Election, *Angilbert* aſſiſted at the Council of *Mantua*, with the Pope's Legates, without their preferring any complaint againſt him, which they would not have failed to have done, eſpecially being ſupported by the Authority of *Lotharius* the Emperor, if *Angilbert*'s Right had not been evident.

And indeed it was not till the Year 1059. that *Nicolas* II. under pretence of putting a ſtop to the Simony into that Dioceſs, and to condemn the *Nicolaitaniſm*, for this was the name, which at that time was beſtowed on the Marriage of Prieſts, ſent *Petrus Damianus* and *Anſelm*, Biſhop of *Lucca*, to *Milan*, who ſubjected that Dioceſs, obliging them to receive the Laws of the Popes Synod, whereas before they had only owned the Laws of the Oecumenical Councils, wherein they had aſſiſted by their Deputies, according to the Proteſtation of *Maurus*, Biſhop of *Ravenna*.

We have a certain proof hereof in the Diſcourſe of the Clergy of *Milan*, with *Petrus Damianus*; for they maintain, 'That the *Ambroſian* Church, according to the 'Ancient Inſtitutions of the Fathers, was always free, 'without being ſubject to the Laws of *Rome*, and that 'the Pope of *Rome* had no juriſdiction over their Church 'as to the Government or Conſtitution of it. *Pet. Dam. Opuſc.* 5.

We may here take notice how *Claudius*, Biſhop of *Turin*, behaved himſelf, with reſpect to Pope *Paſchal*, with whoſe being offended at him *Theodemirus* had reproached him, willing to recommend to him the Pope's Authority.

The matter was ſo clear and evident, that Pope *Honorius* II. being deſirous to make *Anſelm*, Archbiſhop of

Milan, own his Authority, who was choſen in the Year 1123. and to give him the Pall, he refuſed it, in the Year 1125. for fear of ſubjecting his Church to that of *Rome*. See how *Landulphus*, *cap.* 38. relates the matter; as we find it ſet down by *Ughellus*.

Tom. 4 p. 189. *Anſelmus Puſtrella hujus nominis Quintus Archiepiſcopus adlectus eſt Anno* 1123. *De Profectione ejuſdem Romam ad Honorium II. Anno* 1125. *ac de iis quæ ibi peregit, hæc Landulphus capitulo* 38. *Sed cum idem Archiepiſcopus ſecutus conſilium quorundam Capellanorum & Primicerii, Petri verò Terdonenſis Epiſcopi, contra publicum interdictum cleri, & Populi Mediolanenſis, Romani ivit: mihi quidem non ſedit.... veruntamen ipſe, cum vir prudens & ſapiens cum Papa Honorio, & Cardinalibus ejus multa contulit, & conferendo Eccleſiaſticas conſuetudines Ambroſianæ Eccleſiæ, & honores ejus Archiepiſcopatûs & Urbis, vivis & bonis rationibus defendit. Unde ipſe Papa huic Prudenti viro dixit: Frater, meditatus & Epiſcopus veniſti: ſed ſi vis frui Authoritate Archiepiſcopi, in temporibus meis, neceſſe eſt ut ſtolam ſuſcipias è manibus meis; aut ſicut ego ſuſcepi, ad Altare Sancti Petri. Hinc Dominus iſte Mediolanenſis Roboaldum Albenſem adjuravit, ut ſibi conſuleret. Tunc Roboaldus ille Albenſis ſic ait, quod prius ſuſtineret naſum ſuum ſcindi uſque ad oculos, quam daret ſibi conſilium, ut ſuſciperet Romæ ſtolam, & Eccleſiæ Mediolanenſi præpararet hanc novam & graviſſimam quam Honorius Papa dicebat ſibi, imponere menſuram. Mediolanum igitur ipſe Archiepiſcopus ſine ſtola rediit, & eundem Albenſem Epiſcopum ſecum reduxit. Verum Archiepiſcopalem ſedem non aſcendit donec Ubertus de Meregnano, ejus ſcriba, juravit quod ipſe Dominus ſuus Anſelmus nulli minuimento honoris Eccleſiæ Mediolanenſis, conſenſit, & quod ipſum Albenſis ille Epiſcopus Roboaldus, auctoritate ſuâ confirmavit. Deinde Pontifex iſte Anſelmus, ſedem & Caſtella Archiepiſcopatûs in beneficio Cleri & Populi recuperavit.* 'Anſelmus Puſtrella the 'Fifth of that name, was choſen Archbiſhop in the Year '1123. Concerning whoſe journey to *Rome*, to *Honorius* II. 'in the Year 1125. and what he did there, *Landulfus* 'gives us this account, *chap.* 38. But when the ſaid Arch-'biſhop, following the Council of ſome of his Chaplains, 'and

'and of his *Primicerius*, and of *Peter*, Biſhop of *Terdon*, 'contrary to the publick prohibition of the Clergy and 'People of *Milan* was gone to *Rome*.

'However he as a Prudent and Wiſe Man conferred 'at large with Pope *Honorius* II. and his Cardinals, in which 'Conference he with brisk and good Arguments, aſſerted 'the Cuſtoms of the *Ambroſian* Church, with the Prero-'gatives of that Archbiſhoprick and City. Whereupon 'the Pope ſaid to this Prudent Man, Brother, you that 'are a Biſhop come hither well provided with Argu-'ments; but if you have a mind to enjoy the Archiepiſco-'pal Dignity during my time, it is needful that you 'receive the Pall from my hands, or as I my ſelf have 'received it at the Altar of St. *Peter*. Then the Biſhop 'of *Milan* conjured *Roboaldus*, Biſhop of *Alba*, to adviſe 'him in this caſe; whereupon the Biſhop anſwered, That 'he would rather ſuffer his Noſe to be ſlit up to his 'Eyes, than adviſe him to receive his Pall at *Rome*, and 'thereby ſubject the Church of *Milan* to that new and 'hard meaſure, which Pope *Honorius* deſigned to impoſe 'upon her. Wherefore the Archbiſhop *Anſelm* returned 'to *Milan* without his Pall, and brought the Biſhop of '*Alba* back with him. Nevertheleſs he did not place 'himſelf in the Archiepiſcopal Seat, until *Ubertus de Me-'regnano* his Secretary had ſworn that his Lord *Anſelmus* 'had not conſented to the leaſt diminution of the Prero-'gatives of the Church of *Milan*, and the ſame alſo *Roboaldus*, 'Biſhop of *Alba*, confirmed by his Authority. And after this 'Archbiſhop *Anſelm* recovered his Seat, and the Caſtles 'of his Archbiſhoprick, which were at the diſpoſal of the 'Clergy and People.

I know only of two or three Objections about this matter, which deſerve to be conſidered. The one is the prejudice the Popes have endeavoured to foment ſome ages ſince, as if they were the Patriarchs of all the Weſt; in conſequence whereof their Flatterers have endeavoured to make the World believe, That the ſuburbicary Churches, whereof mention is made in the Sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, do ſignifie the Churches of

all the *West*. But this is so fooliſh an imagination, that it is ſtrange that men of any Learning ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be impoſed upon by it. The ſecond is, That we find that ſometimes the Biſhops of the Dioceſs of *Milan* have met in Synods with the Pope and his Council, as if they had belong'd to his Patriarchate. The third is, That *Ughellus* relates, from time to time, in the Catalogue he has given us of the Biſhops of *Milan*, that ſuch and ſuch a one were confirmed by the Pope, and received the Pall at his hands. But it will be eaſie to refute all theſe Objections fully. Firſt, As for that Conceit, that the Pope was *Patriarch* of the *West*; it is a thing unheard of by all Antiquity, and indeed, if *Leo* the Firſt, on the one hand, had known himſelf inveſted with this Right, he would never have ingenuouſly confeſſed, as he has done in his Epiſtles, that he did not pretend to ordain the Biſhops that were amongſt the *Gauls*, which notwithſtanding would have belong'd to his Juriſdiction, in caſe he had been *Patriarch* of the *West*; and on the other hand, he would have made uſe of this Prerogative, in his requeſt to the younger *Valentinian*, when he endeavour'd to procure for himſelf the Right of Appeals, which was conteſted with him, as being an unjuſt and novel Right.

As for what concerns the Union which ſometimes has been made between the Synod of *Italy*, and that of *Rome*, this cannot be made uſe of as an Argument in this Caſe, for the Prelates of *Italy* have aſſiſted at the Synods that have been held amongſt the *Gauls*, without ſubjecting themſelves to the *Gauls* in the leaſt thereby, or without ſubjecting the *Gauls* to *Italy*. We have an Example hereof in the Synod of *Turin*, in the year 397. where the *Gauls* aſſiſted, becauſe the buſineſs of that Synod was to remedy the common Diſorders which equally reigned in the neighbouring Dioceſſes, which maintained Eccleſiaſtical Communion one with another.

And as for that which *Ughellus* ſaith, That ſeveral Biſhops of *Milan* have received the Pall, and been confirmed by the Popes of *Rome*: I confeſs that *Ripamontius* cites a Letter of St. *Gregory*'s to *Lawrence* Biſhop of *Milan*, by which he ſends the Pall to him. But without entring into the examination of

of what this Conceſſion did import, we are to obſerve firſt, That this Pall was no more than a politick Subtilty of the Court of *Rome*, to eſtabliſh amongſt the barbarous and ſtupid Weſtern People, the Edict of *Valentinian* the Third, in favour of appealing to the See of *Rome*; an Edict which could be no longer of force, after the diſſipation of the Roman Empire. Secondly, That at the bottom, this Conceſſion ſignifies little elſe, as *Hincmar* has very well obſerv'd with reſpect to all the Pope's Priviledges, ſave that the Pope did not take away a Right, whereof thoſe to whom he granted the priviledge, were already in full poſſeſſion. Thirdly, That though the thing ſhould be really ſo, yet it took place ſo little, by reaſon of the condition wherein that Dioceſs has been ſince the Popes have made uſe of this Snare, that the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty of that Dioceſs has been little or nothing concerned in it. We know, in the Fourth place, That this granting of the Pall has not taken place, ſave only with ſome ambitious Biſhops, and not with all; as *Ughellus* aſſures us, but without any Proof; as likewiſe when he aſſerts, That it was *Gregory* the Firſt who granted to them the Right of Crowning the Kings of *Italy*. This *Ughellus* was indeed nothing elſe but a Relater of Fables, who does not deſerve any Credit amongſt learned men, though the pains he has taken may be in other things, of very good uſe.

Laſt of all, that which I here aſſert concerning the Independence of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, is ſo clear, that after an Hundred Treatiſes of the Learned of the Church of *Rome*, who have maintain'd, That by the Suburbicary Churches, whereof mention is made in the Sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, all the Weſtern Churches were to be underſtood; M *Dupin* Doctor of the *Sorbonne*, has laid down the Cudgels, confeſſing that the Dioceſs of the Pope conſiſted only of the Ten Provinces about *Rome*, and that *Italy*, compoſed of Seven Provinces, was not in the leaſt ſubject to it.

To conclude, *Chriſtianus Lupus* owns, with all his Reaſons, that the Dioceſs of *Milan*, in the midſt of the Ninth Century, pretended to be independent, as we find it in his Notes

Tom. 3. Notes upon the Council of *Pavia*, under *Leo* IX. He very expreſly obſerves, that this Dioceſs did not own the Laws which the Popes publiſhed in their Councils, as pretending not to depend upon their Regulations.

CHAP. XIV.

Concerning the Separation of the Churches of the Dioceſs of Italy, *from the Church of* Rome; *and of the Faith of the* Paterines.

WHat I have already related concerning the Independence of the Dioceſs of *Italy* on the Pope, was a thing very diſpleaſing and troubleſome to the Church of *Rome*; She could not, without regret, ſee a Dioceſs ſo near to her, preſerve its Liberty, whilſt a great number of other Dioceſſes, at a farther diſtance, had quitted their Rights, and acknowledged her Juriſdiction: *Nicolas* II having undertaken this buſineſs, made choice of *Petrus Damianus* and *Anſelm* Biſhop of *Lucca*, to be his Legates, making the difference which was riſen between the People and the Clergy, upon occaſion of two pretended Hereſies, that of the *Simoniacks*, and that of the *Nicolaitans*, who did not believe themſelves bound to obſerve *Celibacy*, by a meer humane authority. They began alſo to queſtion the Ordinations that had been made by order of the Emperors and other Princes, as if it were no better than pure *Simony*, to get into the Church by this means. Moreover, there was alſo a kind of Tax impoſed upon thoſe who were newly ordain'd, for the uſe of the Biſhops and Archbiſhops, and without paying which, there was ſcarcely any Ordination to be had.

Opuſc. 5. *Petrus Damianus* himſelf tells us, That upon his arrival at *Milan*, the Clergy ſtirr'd up the People to expreſs their diſ-

diſcontent againſt the deſign of this Legation: *Non debere Ambroſianam Eccleſiam Romanis legibus ſubjacere, nullumque judicandi vel diſponendi jus Romano Pontifici in illa ſede competere. Nimis indignum ut quæ ſub progenitoribus noſtris SEMPER extitit libera, ad noſtræ confuſionis opprobrium, nunc alteri, quod abſit, Eccleſiæ ſit ſubjecta.* 'That the *Ambroſian* Church ought not 'to be ſubjected to the Laws of *Rome*; and that the Pope 'of *Rome* had no Right at all of judging or diſpoſing any 'thing there. It was a ſhame, ſaid they, that ſhe who has 'been ALWAIES free in the time of our Foreſathers, 'ſhould now, to our great reproach and confuſion, be for-'ced to truckle, which God forbid, under another 'Church.

The People got together at the ringing of the Bells, and went to the Palace of the Archbiſhop, and put Cardinal *Peter* in danger of his life; as his Friends told him. They expreſs their Indignation, becauſe in the Synod of the Prieſts of that Metropolis, he had had the boldneſs to ſit above the Archbiſhop.

What does this wiſe Legate in this Encounter? He gets up into the Pulpit, and preacheth to them concerning the Dignity of the Roman Church, that the Prerogatives of other Sees had been granted them by the Emperors, but that She only was beholden for her Primacy to Jeſus Chriſt, that thoſe who refuſed to render Obedience to her, did thereby make themſelves Hereticks. In the ſequel of his Sermon he impudently aſſerts three palpable Falſities, the one, that *Nazarius* and *Celſus* had been ſent by St. *Peter* from *Rome* to *Milan*: the other, That St. *Paul* had ſent thither St. *Protaſius* and St *Gervaſius*; and the third, That St. *Ambroſe* had recourſe to the Authority of *Syricius*, to purge his Dioceſs from the Hereſie of the *Nicolaitans*, which began to ſpread it ſelf there. Theſe are the Arguments he makes uſe of and adds a paſſage out of a Book, *De ſacerdotali dignitate*, falſly attributed to St. *Ambroſe*, wherein the Author makes profeſſion of his following the Church of *Rome* in all things, as his Miſtreſs.

'Tis pleaſant to ſee this Impoſtor congratulating himſelf, that he had aſſerted the Prerogative of the Church of *Rome* to ſo good purpoſe. This ſo very Evangelical Sermon ſmooth'd all the Rubs he met with at firſt. He examins the Clergy, and finds almoſt all of them guilty of Simony: What is to be done in this caſe? There is no way left but a Diſpenſation; and this way he takes; he makes the Archbiſhop and his Clergy to promiſe, never for the time to come to exact any thing, either directly or indirectly, of thoſe whom he ordained; he chargeth him to anathematize the Hereſie of the *Nicolaitans*; he makes him promiſe, upon the Goſpel, to exterminate them to the utmoſt of his power; he impoſeth Penance upon him and all his Clergy, and afterwards reſtores to them the Ornaments of their Orders, in the midſt of Maſs, confirming them in the ſame: after he had made them ſwear to receive the Seven General Councils, the laſt of which was the II of *Nice*, concerning the worſhipping of Images, which, it appears, that Dioceſs had before rejected, as well as *France*, *Germany*, and *Spain*, at the Council of *Francfort*, in the year 794, nor can any body read without being aſhamed, the pleaſant Penances he impoſed on them, and the means he put into their hands of buying them off, it being one of the waies the Church of *Rome* had found out to make Sins cheap.

However, this buſineſs did not go off ſo ſucceſsfully as *Petrus Damianus* did expect, for ſoon after his departure, the Archbiſhop *Wido*, and his Clergy, became ſenſible of the falſe ſtep they had made; *Wido*, ſupported by the Nobility called a *Council*, and therein confirmed the Right that Prieſts had to marry. The Story is told by *Bonizo* Biſhop of *Sutrium*, in his Chronicle of the Popes, which is in the Emperor's Library at *Vienna*, as *Lambecius* tells us, *lib.* 2. *Comment*, *Bibliothecæ Vindobonenſis*, p. 790. *Et de Stephano Godefredi Regis Germano, & qualiter ejus temporibus patarea apud Mediolanum exorta eſt, & de Nicolao Papa.* 'And concerning *Stephen Godfey* the King's 'Brother, and how in his time the *Patarea* began at *Milan*, 'and concerning Pope *Nicolas*. Whence Mr. *Ducange* has very well concluded that *Patarea* in the Sence of this Biſhop, ſignifies the pretended Hereſie of the *Patarines*.

The

The account which *Sigonius* gives us of this matter, is this: *Cum multa alia Ecclesia nova de Simoniacorum atque Nicolaitarum Haresi decreta repudiarunt, tum maximè Mediolanensis; ut quæ jampridem Romanæ Ecclesiæ authoritate relictâ, præceptis ejus haudquaquam obtemperaret, & tamen, si qua alia retrò hujusmodi veneno infecta esset: hanc rem cum per se gravem, tum Mediolanensium clericorum nomine, turpem esse Arialdus ex Alciata, ut fertur, familia, clericus decumanus, ratus; Landulfo Cottæ, populi præfecto auctor fuit, ut eam palam oppugnandam aggrederetur. Id vero cum facere secundis populi auribus, animisque cœpisset, Wido Archiepiscopus contrariam partem suscepit, favore maximè nobilitatis innixus. Itaq; res eo usque infamiæ, mutuis altercationibus jurgiisque deducta fuit, ut sacerdotes qui uxores haberent, præ pudore separatim à cæteris rem divinam facere cogerentur in loco qui Patria dicitur, unde vulgo à Pueris Patarini ad contumeliam dicebantur.* 'Whereas many other Churches rejected the 'new Decrees made againſt the Hereſie of *Simoniacks* and '*Nicolaitans*, yet none more than the Church of *Milan*, who 'now, for ſome time, having renounced the Authority of 'the Church of *Rome*, was no longer obedient to its Pre-'cepts, and yet was rather more infected with the Poiſon 'of theſe Hereſies than any other; Therefore one *Arial-'dus*, as was ſaid of the Family of the *Alciati*, and one of 'the chief Clerks, conceiving this a matter as well hainous 'in it ſelf, as reproachful to the repute of the Clergy of *Milan*, 'he perſwades *Landulfus Cotta* the Prefect of the People, 'openly, and with force, to oppoſe himſelf againſt the 'ſame; which when he had undertaken, upon the Peoples 'appearing in favour of his Deſign, *Wido* the Archbiſhop 'takes upon him the defence of the contrary Party, rely-'ing chiefly upon the Favour of the Nobility; ſo that 'this matter was carried to that infamous excels by their 'quarrels and wranglings, that the Prieſts, who had Wives 'were forced for ſhame to ſay Maſs ſeparate from others, 'in a place called *Patria*, or rather *Pataria*, whence the 'boys, by way of Reproach, afterwards gave them the name 'of *Patarines*. Which is a very diſtinct account of the ori-ginal of the name of *Patarines*. I ſhall in the ſequel ob-ſerve, Firſt, That they have given this nick name of *Pata-rines*,

Opusc. 18. rines to the *Waldenſes*, becauſe the *Waldenſes* were thoſe *Subalpini* in *Peter Damian*, who at the ſame time maintain'd the ſame Doctrines in the Archbiſhoprick of *Turin*. Secondly, That the *Waldenſes* have alwaies conſtantly maintain'd, that the Church could not deprive Miniſters of the Liberty of Marrying, foraſmuch as God had never depriv'd them of it, neither in the Old nor New Teſtament. What we are to obſerve here, is, That theſe *Patarines* being ſeparated from the Church of *Rome*, were for the moſt part of the ſame Opinions, that were afterwards aſſerted by the *Waldenſes*, which has been the reaſon why the *Patarines* and *Waldenſes* have been taken for one and the ſame ſort of Hereticks.

This we may know ſeveral ways, *Firſt*, Becauſe ſince the *Romans* drove theſe out of their Communion, which happened in the year 1059, it is natural to conceive, that thoſe *Patarines* had raked together with care all the Articles that might any way juſtifie their Separation.

Secondly, Becauſe the Diſputes of *Leo* IX. with *Michael Cerularius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, gave way to the ſtrengthening of that Separation; that Diſpute having given occaſion to examine ſeveral Articles which the Church of *Rome* propoſed as neceſſary, which the *Greeks* rejected with an high hand.

Thirdly, Becauſe we find that the Church of *Milan*, and thoſe of that Dioceſs, had now for ſome time teſtified a great Averſion for the Idolatry of *Rome*, and by rejecting the Submiſſion to the Church of *Rome*, procured by *Petrus Damianus*, they rejected alſo the Second Council of *Nice*, as favouring Idolatry, according to the definition of their Anceſtors at *Francfort*.

Cap. 4. p. 234. *Fourthly*, Becauſe it appears by the Book of *Lanfranc* againſt *Berengarius*, that ſome Schiſmaticks maintain'd his Opinion, for ſo he expreſſeth himſelf in the account he gives us of the Condemnation of *Berengarius*, in the Council of *Rome*. This probably would paſs for no more than a conjecture, if the thing were not formally avowed by *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter*, who ſaith upon the year, 1087, That *Berengarius* of *Tours*, being fallen into Hereſie, had already almoſt corrupted all the *French*, *Italians*, and *Engliſh*. When he ſpeaks of a Corruption

ruption in these Dioceſſes about this matter, it is evident that he means that they treated the Popes as Innovators and *Paſchaſians*, and that they kept to the Primitive Faith of the Church, which the Popes had endeavoured to condemn by their definitions.

Fifthly, Becauſe it appears, that the *Berengarians*, who were of the ſame ſtamp with the *Patarines*, did diſcourſe much at the ſame rate, as the *Waldenſes* did afterwards: This is evident from *Lanfranc*, where he tells us, That they accuſed the Church to have err'd, by reaſon of Ignorance, and that the Church remain'd in their Party alone, and they with *Berengarius* called the Church of *Rome*, *The Congregation of the Wicked*, *and the Seat of Satan.*

Sixthly, Becauſe we find the *Berengarians* expos'd to the ſame Calumnies, which were afterward imputed to the *Patarines* and *Waldenſes*. This is evident from the Diſcourſe of *Guimondus* Biſhop of *Averſa*, *lib.* 1. *contra Bereng.* where he accuſeth them of overthrowing, as much as in them lay, lawful Marriages, and the Baptiſm of Infants. *T.* 6. *Bib. Pat.* p. 216.

Seventhly, Becauſe it appears from what is left us of the Writings of *Bonizo* Biſhop of *Sutrium*, who took Pen in hand in defence of the Popes Pretenſions over this Dioceſs, that his aim was to aſſert the ſelf-ſame Roman Doctrines, which in proceſs of time we find conſtantly oppos'd by the *Waldenſes* in that Dioceſs. See here one of his Notes, taken out of his Paradiſe of St. *Auſtin*, *De Baptiſmi ſacramento, & de corporis & ſanguinis Domini Euchariſtia —— ſcrutare viriliter.* *Tom.* 1. *Lamb.* pag. 791.

In his Eighth Abridgment he treats about, *Quid ſit infernus, & utrum in inferno mali tantum, an etiam boni manſuri ſint, & an corpora poſſint eſſe in uſtione ignis perpetua, & quibus ſacrificium proſit poſt mortem, & qualiter mortui in ſomniis viventibus appareant, & de oblatione vel eleemoſyna pro defunctis, & quod Adam morte Dominica ab inferno ſit liberatus.* 'What Hell is, and 'whether the Wicked only, or the Good alſo, are to remain 'there: Whether Bodies can continue in everlaſting Burn-'ings; and to whom the Sacrifice of the Maſs is available 'after death; and how the Dead may appear to the Living P. 792.

'in their Dreams; and about Offerings and Alms for the 'Dead; and that *Adam* was deliver'd out of Hell by the 'death of our Lord.' An understanding Reader will easily judge, that these kind of Questions are such as could not be discussed, without entring into those Controversies that at this day we have with the Church of *Rome*.

This *Bonizo* was killed by those of *Placenza*, in the year 1089, as he was defending the Cause of the Popes of *Rome* against the Emperors, whom he cruelly abused in his Writings. He has given us an account in Writing, of the first Rise of *Patarea* at *Milan*, under Pope *Stephen* II.

Ibid. p. 798.

Two things more may be added to what I have already observed; the first is, That it is apparent, that tho' the Abbot *Gezo* had endeavoured to confirm his Monks in the Opinions of *Paschasius*, by copying almost his whole Book, to make it more common in *Italy*, yet notwithstanding, that of *John Scot* continued still in being, and was the Shield which *Berengarius* and his Party made use of, to oppose the Opinions of *Paschasius*. He was not condemned till the year 1059, in the Council of *Verceil*, under *Leo* IX, and the *Italians* almost immediately thereupon separated themselves from the Communion of the Pope of *Rome*.

The Second is, That there was such a great number of these *Berengarians*, who did not hold their Doctrine from *Berengarius*, but from *John Scot* and others, that this became the Subject of a great Contest: this is evident from the Life of the Abbot *Wolfelmus*. The same is likewise hinted to us by *Sigebert*, *ad Ann.* 1081, in the Edition of *Miræus*, in the year 1608. *Istis diebus Francia turbabatur per Berengarium Turonensem, qui asserebat Eucharistiam, quam sumimus in altari, non esse revera corpus & sanguinem Christi: unde contra eum & pro eo multum à multis & verbis & scriptis disputatum est.* 'In those days there were Disturbances in *France*, 'by means of *Berengarius* of *Tours*, who maintain'd, That the 'Eucharist which we receive on the Altar, is not the true Bo'dy and Blood of Christ: which occasion'd great Disputes 'both for and against him, as well by writing Books as by 'publick Disputations.

Sur. ad April 22. cap. 6.

We

We may gather the same truth we here set down from the compendious account we find in the Councils, in the place of the Acts of the Council of *Rome* in the Year 1079. under *Gregory* VII. against *Berengarius*. This account which we find likewise in the Chronicle of *Verdun*, written by *Hugo*, Abbot of *Flavigny*, contains these expres words; *Omnibus igitur in Ecclesia Servatoris congregatis, habitus est Sermo de Corpore & Sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, multis hac, nonnullis illa* * [*prius*] *sentientibus. Maxima si videm pars panem & vinum per sacra orationis verba, & sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti sub stantialiter in Corpus Dominicum de Virgine natum, quod & in Cruce pependit, & in Sanguinem, qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea, asserebat,* [*atque authoritatibus Orthodoxorum Patrum, tam Græcorum, quam Latinorum defendebat*] *Quidam verò cæcitate nimiâ & longâ perculsi figura tantum* † *substantiale illud corpus in dextera Patris sedens esse, seque & alios decipientes, quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere. Verum ubi cœpit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventum fuerit in* * *Synodo, defecit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus Sancti ignis emolumenta* † *palearum consumens, & fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans, noctis caliginem vertit in Lucem.* 'All of them therefore being met together 'in St. *Saviours* Church, they discoursed the matter about 'the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, many 'of them being of one, some *[at first] of another Opi- 'nion. For the greatest part of them maintained that 'the Bread and Wine by means of the sacred words and 'the Priests Consecration, through an invisible Operation 'of the Spirit, were changed substantially into the Body 'of our Lord born of the Virgin, and which hung on 'the Cross; and into the Blood which gush'd from his 'Side when pierced with the Soldiers Spear †[and fully 'confirmed the same with the Authorities of Orthodox 'Greek and Latin Fathers] But some being smitten with 'an over great, and long continued Blindness, endeavoured 'to prove by Sophistical Cavillation, that it was figura- 'tively only * the substantial Body sitting at the right 'hand of the Father, deceiving themselves and others.

T. 10. Concil. Edit. Lab. pag. 379.

* Hæc vox abest à Codice MS. Thuyeano Conciliorum quem habeo præ manibus.

Inclusa non habentur in MS. Codice Concil.

† MS. atque.

* MS. Synodam.

† MS. Elementa.

* These words are not found in the MS. Book of the Council

† These words are not found in the MS. Copy.

* MS. and that the substantial Body was sitting, &c.

'But

'But when the matter began to be handled, even before 'they had met the Third Day in Council together, this 'Party ceased any longer to oppose the Truth; the Fire 'of the Holy Ghost consuming these chaffy * emoluments, 'and by his Brightness dispersing the false Light and 'darkning it, changed the darkness of the Night into 'Light.

* MS. Elements.

This is the account of what past in the Council, and is found in the MS. of the Councils which I have consulted; though they who have published the Councils, have changed it at their pleasure. But whatever pains they may have taken herein, it appears,

1. That *Berengarius* was not the Author of that Opinion in *Italy*, the greatest part of whose Bishops were summoned to that Council by *Gregory* VII.

2. That this Council was at first much divided, and that this division continued Two Days, and was not ended till the Third Day.

3. That the words of a long Blindness, which the Author uses, cannot be spoken with reference to the Disciples of *Berengarius*, but must refer to those who maintained the same Doctrine which he did, from the time wherein this Question, having been first started by *Paschasius* and *Radbertus*, had occasioned that Division; whereof the Book of *John Scot*, which was burnt at *Verceil*, was an authentick Testimony.

But I believe I have sufficiently made out in the foregoing Chapters, that the Dioceses of *Italy*, did always enjoy a Light of Doctrine of competent Purity; as likewise, that the Purity of Divine Worship ever continued amongst them, notwithstanding they had a little sprinkling of that ignorance and Spirit of Superstition, which had overflow'd the Romish Church, and the greatest part of the Western Churches. We had also a particular information, in what manner *Italy* separated it self from the Church of *Rome*, when she undertook to invade her Rights, and to impose upon her her own Errors and Superstitions. We have seen that a Party as well of the Superiour as Inferior Clergy, and the sounder part of the People,

People, formed a distinct Body, to secure themselves from that Corruption.

This Separation of the Clergy of *Milan*, from the Party of *Landulphus Cotta*, and of *Arialdus*, Deacon of *Milan*, who favoured the Interests and Pretensions of the Pope and the separation of those *Subalpini* in the Bishoprick of *Turin*, deserves, as we see, an extraordinary Consideration. And forasmuch as this Separation happened at the same time that the Council of *Vercell* condemned *Berengarius*, and *Johannes Scotus*, we may easily conceive that the Clergy of *Milan*, and those Clergymen under the Alps, had no great esteem for that Papal Condemnation: and the Interest of *Wido* being embraced by many of the Bishops of his Dioceſs, we cannot but conclude, That they had as little regard for that Council, as they had for all the rest, that was derived from an Authority, whose design was to invade these Rights, as well as those of all the Bishops of the West.

To shew to what excess this Division was carried, it is not necessary to set down here the Bloody Death of the Deacon *Arialdus*, which *Andrew* the Monk has described in a very Tragical manner, as we find it in *Baronius*, upon the Year 1066. thereby to expose *Wido*, and make him odious. It is evident, that what that Monk wrote, is composed in such a legendary manner, that it renders all his Relation suspicious; though if it were true indeed, yet could it scarcely more diffame *Wido*, than so many Popes, who have destroyed their opposers, by the way of Arms, that being the Custom of these Barbarous Ages. *Annal. Eccl. ad h. A.* §. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.

But we are to make our Observation upon the Endeavours which the Popes have used ever since this Separation, to reconcile to themselves this part of the Clergy of *Milan* and *Italy*, who had separated themselves from the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. *Alexander* II. in the Year 1067. sent two Legats to *Milan*, who confirming what *Petrus Damianus*, Cardinal of *Ostia*, had done, past the same into Orders and Regulations that were to be strictly observed, as being pronounced

in

in the Name of God, St. *Peter* and St. *Ambroſe*, under pain of the ſame Anathemas to the Impenitent as were incurred by *Corah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*, and by *Judas*, *Pilate* and *Caiaphas*, which are the very words of their Order.

Lib. 1. *Epiſt.* 15. But we find by the Epiſtles of *Gregory* VII. to the *Lombards*, that the Clergy of *Milan*, only laught at theſe Regulations, having choſen *Godfrey* for their Biſhop. And the ſaid *Gregory* ſeems on this account to look upon them as the great Enemies of the Chriſtian Religion, and that he did not think himſelf ſecure amongſt them in the Year 1077. above all; becauſe they took part with *Henry* IV. againſt *Gregory*, whom they look'd upon as juſtly depoſed.

Epiſt. 23. *Lib.* 4.

Lib. 1. *Ep.* 11. We find the ſame *Gregory* endeavouring to ſtrengthen his Party againſt the Biſhops of *Lombardy*, in oppoſing to them the Authority of the Counteſs *Beatrix*, and her Daughter *Mathilda* who called thoſe Biſhops the forerunners of Antichriſt. He endeavours to draw away the Biſhop of *Pavia*, from taking part with thoſe of *Milan*. He immediately excommunicated *Godfrey*, Biſhop of *Milan*, and Succeſſor of *Wido*, and orders the ſaid Excommunication to be publiſhed throughout the whole Earth. He engages the Emperor *Henry* IV. to abandon the cauſe of thoſe of *Milan* and *Lombardy*, who were called *Simoniacks*, only becauſe they were willing to maintain the Emperors Rights, in reference to inveſtitures, againſt the Enterpriſes of ſome Popes that were before him.

Lib. 1. *Epiſt.* 12.

Lib. 1. *Epiſt.* 15.

Lib. 1. *Ep.* 29.

The following Year he ſummons the Suffragans of the Biſhoprick of *Milan*, and the Abbots of that Dioceſs to come up to *Rome*, and to be preſent at the Council.

Lib. 1. *Epiſt.* 48.

In ſhort, we meet with nothing in the Sequel, but reiterated endeavours, to deſtroy the Party of *Italy* that oppoſed them.

Our buſineſs now ſhould be to ſhew, that this Body or Party has continued ever ſince until the Reformation, under the name of *Patarines*, and afterwards of *Waldenſes*. But before we come to this, we are bound to prevent the Slanders, which the Malice of the Romiſh Party has raiſed againſt theſe Separators. They have accuſed them

them to be an Assembly of *Cathari*, that is, a Sect of Manichees. This is the notion the Authors of the Eleventh and following Centuries give us of them. *Giraldus Cambrensis*, who wrote in the Year 1200. accuseth the *Patareans* and *Cathari*, with rejecting the carnal presence. *Dist.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Gemma Eccles. MS. Lambethani. Vincentius Bellucensis Specul. Histor. l.* 30. *cap.* 7. attributes several Heresies to these *Milaneses*.

CHAP. XV.

Concerning the Belief of the Manichees, of their rise in Italy, *their growth and their establishment.*

I Conceive that the account I have given of the State of the Church of *Italy*, is sufficient to make out, That as they enjoyed a sound knowledge in that Dioceſs, so withal there was a great disposition amongst them, as well as in other Western parts, to embrace the grossest of Errors. Christians and Priests that are become *Anthropomorphites*, and who know nothing of Religion, but what they have learnt from Images, which were justly called the Books of the Ignorant, have a great inclination to suffer themselves to be imposed upon by Impostures. Of this we have a double proof. It was especially in the Tenth Century that the Opinion of *Paschasius* attained Strength and Authority; an Opinion, which we may well look upon as the most extravagant folly that ever any Man dream'd of whilest awake. It was at the end of the same Century, and the beginning of the next, that Manicheism, the most wild Heresie the Devil could ever suggest, found many followers in *Italy* and *Aquitain*, which were inhabited by the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*. And

foraſmuch as in the Sequel it will prove of great uſe to know this matter of fact, for the Juſtification of the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*, and thoſe, who before they ever got theſe names, did, in both theſe Dioceſſes, defend the intereſts of Truth, by diſtinguiſhing them from thoſe who adopted the Sentiments of the Manichees, we can by no means paſs it by here.

Biſhop *Uſher* indeed has already ſufficiently done this, in his Treatiſe of the Succeſſion of the Proteſtant Churches, where he relates the arrival of the Manicheans into the Weſt. But becauſe as probably, the Biſhop of *Meaux* had never ſeen this Book, he was pleaſed to look upon the diſtinction which the Proteſtants make of the *Albigenſes* and *Waldenſes*, from the Manichees, as an evaſion of ſome late Miniſters; it lies upon us, to prove it to that degree of Evidence, as that no doubt or difficulty may remain in the caſe.

I know well enough that this would ſeem not neceſſary with reference to the *Waldenſes*, whom the Biſhop of *Meaux* only terms Schiſmaticks: But though the Biſhop be of this Opinion, yet there may be others found of his Communion, as there have been many before him, who will be little ſway'd by his Authority; and therefore the matter is well worth our Conſideration.

In the *Firſt* place I ſhall lay down the ſubſtance of their Belief.

Secondly, I ſhall ſhew that about the Year of our Saviour 1000. ſome of theſe Manichees began to ſpread in the Weſt. And ſhall,

Thirdly, Take notice in what particular places they abounded.

In purſuing this matter on further, I ſhall make it evidently appear, That the Party of the Church of *Rome* have made great uſe of the name of theſe Hereticks, to perſecute thoſe who ſet themſelves againſt the Errors and Superſtitions of that Church, though indeed they had nothing in common with the Manichees.

1. Then

1. Then the *Manichees* held, that there were two Principles opposite to each other, and equally eternal, the one good, and the other evil; and that consequently there were two natures, the one of that which was good, the other of that which was evil. *Epiph. Her. 66.*

2. They lookt upon Matter as the effect of the evil God, and took the Flesh to be wholly evil, and therefore they abhorred the begetting of Children, and hindred it to the utmost of their power, by condemning Marriage. *S. Aug. l. 15. cont. Faust. c. 4, 5, 6, 7 & l. 19. c. 29.*

3. They rejected the Old Testament, maintaining, that he who spake to *Moses*, was the Prince of Darkness. *S. Aug. lib. de Hæres.*

4. They maintain'd, That the Creation of Man was performed by the same Author, and that there were two Souls in every Man, the one good, and the other bad; the one proceeding from God, and the other from the Prince of Darkness. Thus it was, they understood the Conflict between the Flesh and the Spirit, whereof St. *Paul* speaks. *S. Epiph. Her. 66. S. Aug. L. de duab. anim. S. Aug. de Her.*

5. They denied Free-Will, because otherwise God would be the Author of Sin. *S. Aug. de lib. Arb.*

6. They maintain'd, That the New Testament had been falsified, and under this Pretence they admitted only of so much of it as pleased them. *S. Aug. l. 17. cont. Faust. c. 3.*

7. They denied that Jesus Christ had any true Flesh, maintaining, that he had only the figure and appearance of it, to delude the Eyes. They denied his Death, and Resurrection, and fasted on Sundays, as in opposition and contradiction to our Saviour's Resurrection. *S. Epiph. Her. 66. & Theod. l. 1. Har. Fab. c. 26.*

8. They asserted, That he was not come to save the Bodies, but only the Souls of Men; and they absolutely denied the Resurrection of the Body. *S. Aug. l. 4. cont. Faust. c. 2.*

9. They believed, that Jesus Christ was in the Sun and the Moon, and the Holy Ghost throughout the whole Air. When they worshipped, they turned themselves towards the Sun, and worshipped the Sun and Moon, as containing Jesus Christ. *Id. vide l. 20. c. 20.*

10. They rejected Baptism, as unnecessary to Salvation. *Id. lib. de Her.*

Id. l. 20. cont. Faust. c. 11.

11. As for the Eucharist, they asserted, according to the account St. *Augustin* gives us of them, That the Holy Ghost did beget Jesus Christ of the Earth, subject to suffering, who was, as it were, bound in the Ears of Corn, and in the Vine, but who by the digestion of the Stomach was set loose and at liberty; yet they maintain'd withal, that Wine was the Gall of the Prince of Darkness, and therefore rejected the use of Wine in the Communion.

L. de Hær. & lib. de Morib. Manich. c. 19, & 20.

St. *Augustin* ascribes to these Hereticks a continual contradiction in their Opinions; and above all, he sets forth their Eucharist, as a thing so abominable, as the very notion of it is sufficient to strike one with horror, notwithstanding that they boasted themselves of keeping their mouths pure from any Blasphemy against God, of never eating any Flesh, or drinking Wine; of having their Hands clean from Murther, and their Bosoms pure and chast, because their Elect gloried in their observing perpetual Chastity, and rejecting the use of Marriage.

S. Aug. l. 20. cont. Faust. c. 21.

As for his attributing to them, That they had an Aversion for the Reliques of the Saints; this seems to be a Consequence of their Opinions concerning the Original of the Body, which they lookt upon as proceeding from the evil Principle.

S. Aug. l. de Hær.

12. They condemned Husbandry, attributing to Trees and Plants a sensitive Life.

Id. l. 22. cont. Faust. c. 74. & seq.

13. They maintained, That War was altogether unlawful.

These were their principal Heresies. As for the Discipline of their Sect, it consisted of two Orders, *viz.* the *Elect* and *Auditors*.

The Hearers had leave to marry, if they pleased; to eat Flesh, and till the Ground; all which was forbidden to the Elect.

The Elect had the Power of the imposing of Hands on their Hearers, who kneeled before them, in order to receive the said Imposition.

There were twelve principal Elect, who were called the Masters, who had a thirteenth that was over them.

They

They had Seventy two Bishops, who were created by those Masters we have just now mentioned, and the Bishops ordained the Priests and Deacons. This is the account St. *Augustin* gives us of their Hierarchy.

Petrus Diaconus of *Sicily*, who wrote against them about the year 870, makes it appear that he was acquainted with them, as having been with them at *Tibrica* in *Armenia*, and conferred with them. He dedicates his Book to the Archbishop of *Bulgaria*, advertizing him, that the *Paulitiani* or *Manichees* of *Tibrica* were resolved to send some of their People into *Bulgaria*, to seduce those who had newly embraced the Christian Religion in that Kingdom. This was that which put him upon writing this Treatise, to forearm that Prelate against their Enterprizes. *In Biblioth. Pat.*

He accuseth them of dissembling their Errors, and of making such a Profession of Faith, as was sufficiently Orthodox, though indeed, and at the bottom, they oppos'd it, and makes a very exact description of them and their Errors.

He tells us, That they in appearance admit of the whole Gospel, and all the Epistles of St. *Paul*; that they confess the Trinity and Incarnation, but that they elude these their Confessions by equivocations, till they have got an entrance into the Spirit of those who listen to them, and judge them susceptible of their Impieties, which then they freely discover to them. He comprizeth their Opinions in Six Articles:

I. That there is a good God and an evil God; the first the Creator of the World to come; and, the second, the Creator of the World.

II. That they do not own the Virgin *Mary* to have been the Mother of Jesus Christ, whose Body, according to them, was brought down from Heaven.

III. That they reject the Eucharist, denying that Jesus Christ ever consecrated the Symbols of Bread and Wine; but they explain those words in a mystical sence, with reference to his actions.

IV. That they deny the Cross of Jesus Christ.

V. That

V. That they reject the Old Teſtament, receiving nothing beſides the Goſpels, and the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, to which they add the Epiſtles of one *Sergius*, one of the Heads of their Sect.

VI. That they removed Prieſts from the Miniſtry of the Church. In a word he ſets forth their Hereſies much according to the account we find of them in St. *Cyril* Biſhop of *Hieruſalem*, *Catechef.* 6. out of whom he has tranſcrib'd many long paſſages.

I will not trouble my ſelf at preſent to ſet down the account which later Authors have given of the *Manichees*. *Emericus* in his *Directory of the Inquiſitors*, has made an abridgment of the Opinions of thoſe amongſt them, which he pretends appeared in *Italy*, under the Popedom of *Innocent* the Third, who had for their Maſter a Perſon called *Manes*, who lived then in the Dioceſs of *Milan*. This good Inquiſitor, as we ſee by this, was not over-well acquainted with Church-Hiſtory. However, he takes notice of ſome Articles, which it may be worth while to obſerve here. Of the Fourteen Articles he aſcribes to them, theſe following may ſerve to clear ſome things we have already ſet down concerning the Belief and Conduct of the *Manichees*.

2 *p. direct. q.* 13. *pag.* 274.

The Second Article is, That they ſuppoſed two ſorts of Churches, the one kind and meek, which they ſaid was their Sect, and the Church of Jeſus Chriſt; the other malicious, which they ſaid was the Church of *Rome*, and very impudently called her, a Mother of Fornications, the great *Babylon*, a Whore, the Devil's Cathedral, and the Synagogue of Satan.

The Third Article is, That they condemned all the Degrees, Orders, and Ordinations of the Holy Church, as well as her Ordinances, which they corrupted; they called all thoſe Hereticks that were of her Communion, and publickly taught that they could not be ſaved in the Communion of *Rome*.

The

The Fourth Article is, That all the Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*, which were inſtituted by our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, *viz.* The Euchariſt, Baptiſm, which is celebrated with material Water, Confirmation, Orders, Extreme Unction, Penance, and Matrimony between Man and Wife, were all of them vain and frivolous, and that like Apes, they feigned certain other outward Ceremonies, which had ſome reſemblance with them.

The Fifth Article is, That inſtead of Holy Baptiſm, they fancied another Spiritual Baptiſm, which they called, the Comfort of the Holy Ghoſt; that is to ſay, when they received any Perſon, whether Sick or in Health, into their Sect, or ordained them by impoſition of hands, according to their execrable Ceremonies.

The Sixth Article is, That inſtead of conſecrated Bread, or the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, they ſuppoſed another ſort of Bread, which they called Bleſt Bread, or the Bread of Holy Prayer, which they took in their hands, at the beginning of their Meals, bleſſing it, breaking and diſtributing it to thoſe that were preſent, of their Belief, according to their ordinary Cuſtom.

The Seventh Article is, That inſtead of the Sacrament of Penance they ſaid, that the true Exerciſe of Penance did conſiſt in following their Orders, and being of their Sect; and maintain'd, that all thoſe who being ſick or in health, did keep the Laws of their Sect and their Ordinances, did thereby obtain the Pardon of their Sins, without any other ſatisfaction; yea, even without making reſtitution of thoſe things which they had unjuſtly got; affirming moreover, that herein they had the ſame Power that St. *Peter* and St *Paul*, with the other Apoſtles of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, had. They ſaid alſo, that the Confeſſion of Sins that is made to Prieſts of the Romiſh Communion, is not of any uſe to Salvation; and that neither the Pope nor any other perſon of that Communion, had the power of forgiving Sins.

The Eighth Article is, That inſtead of the carnal Sacrament of Marriage between Man and Wife, they ſuppoſed that there was another ſpiritual Marriage between God and the Soul of Man; when being perfect Hereticks, or in the abundance of Conſolati-

Conſolations, they received any one into their Sect, and incorporated them into their Order.

The Ninth Article is, That they denied the Incarnation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in the Womb of the moſt Holy Virgin. They aſſerted, That he did not take upon him a true humane Body, nor the true Fleſh of Man, as other men take it from Humane Nature; that he never truly ſuffer'd or died on the Tree of the Croſs, that he never truly roſe again, nor aſcended into Heaven with a Body of Humane Fleſh, but that all theſe things were only done in appearance.

The Tenth Article is, That the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary* was not the Mother of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: they deny alſo that ſhe was a carnal Woman, but maintain'd, that their Sect was, that *Mary* that Virgin, the true Penance, that ſhe was chaſt, and a Virgin, who begat Children to God, as often as any were received into their Order and Sect.

The Eleventh Article is, That they denied the Reſurrection of our Bodies, and inſtead thereof, ſuppoſed certain ſpiritual Bodies, or a kind of inward Men, in which they ſaid the future Reſurrection was to be celebrated.

The Twelfth Article is, They ſaid and believed that all thoſe Spirits that departed out of humane Bodies, went into the Bodies of Beaſts and Birds, if they were not received into their Sect, or incorporated into their Order, by the impoſition of their hands, according to the cuſtomary form of their Ceremonies, that all theſe Souls paſſed continually from one Body into another; for which reaſon they did not eat the Fleſh of any living Creature, nor ever kill'd any Birds.

The Thirteenth Article is, That they held, that Man ought never to eat Fleſh, no, not ſo much as touch it, nor Cheeſe, nor Eggs, nor any thing proceeding from Fleſh by way of generation or carnal conjunction: which they alſo obſerved.

Theſe are the Hereſies of the *Manichees*, which *Emericus* ſets down after another manner than they are deſcribed by

by *Archelaus*, S. *Cyril*, S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Auguſtin*, *Theodoretus*, and *Petrus Diaconus* of *Sicily*. 'Tis viſible, that ſome part of theſe Hereſies were only *Chimera's*, occaſion'd by ſome allegorical expreſſions of thoſe who then preached againſt the Romiſh Church, but however, moſt maliciouſly and falſly attributed to the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*.

Notwithſtanding this *Emericus* his miſtake in the account he gives us of the original of this Sect, ſure it is, that it owns its Birth to one called *Scythianus*, who probably had been familiar with the *Marcionites*. He left his Doctrine to one named *Terebinthus*, after whoſe death, it came into the hands of *Manes*, who mixed ſomething of the Goſpel with it, and who gave the Name to his Followers.

This Sect ſpread it ſelf in *Africa*, *Aſia*, *Spain*, and *Italy*, and notwithſtanding, that in proceſs of time, the Chriſtian Emperors publiſhed ſeveral Laws for their extirpation, yet we find that there ſtill continued a conſiderable body of them in the *Eaſt*. *Theophanes* tells us, that there were ſome of this Sect amongſt the *Syrians* and *Armenians*, in the Eighth Century, whom the Emperor *Conſtantine* tranſported into *Thrace*, from *Theodoſiopolis* and *Melitene*, who ſpread abroad the Hereſies of the *Paulicians* (or *Publicani*,) for ſo *Anaſtaſius* calls them. *Theoph.*

We find in the Ninth Century, *A.* 811, that the Emperor *Nicephorus* favoured the *Manichees*, called *Paulicians* & *Acingani*, who lived in *Phrygia* and *Lycaonia*. *Michael Rangabe* being Emperor, perſecuted them, kil'd ſome, and baniſh'd the reſt.

We find in the Tenth Century, that *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Antioch* obliged the Emperor *John Zimiſces* to baniſh the *Manichees* into the *weſt*, that had ſpread themſelves through out all the *Eaſt*, and had infected all places with their Hereſies; which he accordingly did, as we find it reported by *Zonaras*. *Zonar.* T. 3. p. 167.

We find ſince that time, that they ſpread themſelves from *Bulgaria* (being thence called *Bulgari*, and in the French Tongue *Boulgres*) into *Dalmatia*, and from thence into the Weſtern Provinces, where they were called *Cathari*, and thence by miſtake *Cathari* or *Catharini*, the *Germans* calling them *Ketters*. And 'tis probable that from this School came thoſe *Manichees*, that appeared in *Italy*, as well as *Joan. Zimiſce*, *Glab. Radul.* l. 3 c. 8.

thoſe that appeared at *Orleans*, in the year 1017, and afterwards in *Languedoc*. *Vignier* has publiſhed a Fragment of an ancient Author, who calls them *Catharini*, and who ſets forth their ſettling of themſelves in *Lombardy*, *Tuſcany*, and in the *Marchia*; That about the year 1023 their firſt Biſhop was called *Marc*, who deriv'd his Ordination from *Bulgaria*, who afterwards, at the ſollicitation of one *Nicetas* Pope, come from *Conſtantinople*, he took Orders of him, and entred into the Order of *Druncaria*. Afterwards he repreſents the different Parties and different Opinions amongſt them. We find alſo, that *Raynerus*, who in the XIII Century gives us a deſcription of their Churches, makes three ſorts of *Cathari* in *Lombardy*, obſerving that thoſe who had ſetled themſelves at *Thouſe*, were of the ſame opinion with thoſe who called themſelves *Albanenſes*, or of *Senzano* in *Lombardy*.

Now, that we may make ſome uſe of this deſcription of the *Manichees* and their Errors, it will be needful to obſerve,

Firſt, That ſince they began to puniſh the *Manichees* with Death, it was very natural for thoſe who had a mind to deſtroy thoſe they call'd Hereticks, to charge them with their Errors: So that we may here very eaſily be miſtaken, between the true *Manichees*, and thoſe to whom their Errors were falſly imputed.

Secondly, That ſince they had repreſented to the People, that one of the Characters of the *Manichees* was, to diſſemble their Errors, and exactly to conceal their Abominations; they had a very good pretence to condemn thoſe pretended Hereticks for half *Manichees*, who according to the Principles of the *Manichees*, conceal'd their true Opinions, though they did ſo upon another ground, as the rigour of their Perſecutors.

Thirdly, That in thoſe barbarous and cruel Ages, a ſmall conformity of Opinions with the *Manichees*, was a ſufficient ground to accuſe them of Manicheiſm, who oppoſed any Doctrines received by the Church of *Rome*. Thus would they have taken the *Anabaptiſts* for downright *Manichees*, becauſe they condemn'd the Baptiſm of Infants.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, And indeed we ſhall find the Prejudices conceived on this account were ſo ſtrong, that it has made them to be accuſed of Manicheiſm, whoſe Opinions evidenc'd, that their Principles were directly oppoſite to thoſe of the *Manichees*, with as much ground, as if we ſhould accuſe the Church of *Rome* of Manicheiſm, upon pretence of her forbidding the uſe of the Cup, with reference to the People, which formerly was a Note of Manicheiſm; as we find it mentioned in the Decrees of the Popes, *Leo* and *Gelaſius*.

They accuſed thoſe of Manicheiſm that denied the ſubſtantial Converſion of the Bread into the Body of Jeſus Chriſt. They call'd thoſe *Manichees* that would not worſhip the Virgin or the Croſs; as if, forſooth, they had denied that Jeſus Chriſt took a true Body in the Womb of the Virgin, or that he had been truly crucified.

CHAP. XVI.

Concerning the Cathari *ſpoken of by* Evervinus *and St.* Bernard, *and their Diſtinction from the* Patarines.

WE are obliged to *Mabillon* for having communicated to us the Letter of *Evervinus*, *Præpoſitus* of *Steinfield*, in the Dioceſs of *Cologne*. It is evident, that he has deſcribed the ſame Hereticks, whereof *Egbertus* Monk of *Schonauge* makes mention in his Sermons. Only he diſtinguiſhes them into two Orders, the one whereof he ſets forth to us as *Manichees*; the others, whom he does not accuſe of any thing like what they were charg'd with. He makes ſo great a diſtinction between them, that it is very ſtrange the Biſhop of *Meaux* ſhould confound them as he does, as if they had been but one and the ſame Body of Men.

Now, since it is very probable, according to the Judgment of *Mabillon*, that this Letter of *Evervinus* to St. *Bernard*, furnished this famous Abbot, with an occasion of handling those Controversies, which he has touched upon in his Sermons upon the *Canticles*; it will be worth the while to set down the said Letter of *Evervinus*, as to its principal points, and the rather, because it serves to set forth the Sincerity of *Petrus Gloriosensis*, in the manner he has taken to treat those Controversies, following therein very exactly the Notions of *Evervinus*, and carefully distinguishing those two sorts of Opinions he opposeth; whereas St. *Bernard* seems to have much more confounded them.

Now what *Evervinus* writes to St. *Bernard*, a little before the year 1140, is this:

T. 3. *Annal.* p. 453. *& seq.*

'THere have been lately some Hereticks discovered amongst us, near *Cologne*, whereof some with satisfaction return'd again to the Church: Two of these, *viz.* one that was a Bishop amongst them, and his Companions, openly opposed us in the Assembly of the Clergy and Laity, the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the Nobility, maintaining their Heresie from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, upon which they might bring along with them Men skilful in their Belief, promising to return to the Church, provided they should find their Masters defective in answering what was opposed to them; but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their Judgment. Upon this their Declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent, they were seized by the People, being incited by overmuch zeal, and put into the Fire and burnt, and (what is most wonderful) they entred to the Stake, and bare the Torment of the Fire, not only with patience, but with joy and gladness. In this case, O holy Father, were I present with you, I should be glad to have your answer, how these Mem-

bers

'bers of the Devil could with ſuch Courage and Con-
'ſtancy perſiſt in their Hereſie, as is ſcarcely to be found
'in the moſt Religious in the Faith of Chriſt.

'Their Hereſie is this: They ſay that the Church is
'only amongſt them, becauſe they alone follow the ſteps
'of Chriſt, and continue in the imitation of the true A-
'poſtolick Life, not ſeeking the things of this World,
'poſſeſſing neither Houſe, Lands nor any thing in pro-
'priety, according as Chriſt did who neither poſſeſſed any
'himſelf, nor gave leave to his Diſciples to poſſeſs any
'thing. Whereas ye (ſay they to us) join Houſe to
'Houſe and Field to Field, ſeeking the things of this World:
'ſo that even they alſo, who are looked upon as moſt
'perfect amongſt you, ſuch as are your Monks and Re-
'gular Canons, though they do not poſſeſs theſe things
'as proper, but as common, yet do they poſſeſs all theſe
'things. And of themſelves they ſay, We the poor of
'Chriſt, who have no certain abode, fleeing from one
'City to another, like Sheep in the midſt of Wolves,
'do endure Perſecution with the Apoſtles and Martyrs:
'notwithſtanding that we lead an Holy and Strict Life
'in faſting and abſtinence, perſevering day and night in
'Prayers and Labors, and ſeeking only from thence for
'what is neceſſary to ſupport our Lives, we maintain our
'ſelves thereby, becauſe we are not of the World. But
'as for you lovers of the World, ye have Peace with
'the World, becauſe ye are of the World. Falſe A-
'poſtles, who adulterate the Word of Chriſt, ſeeking
'their own have miſled you and your Forefathers;
'whereas we and our Fathers, being born Apoſtles, have
'continued in the Grace of Chriſt, and ſhall continue ſo
'to the end of the World. To diſtinguiſh us from one
'another, Chriſt ſaith, By their Fruits ye ſhall know them:
'our Fruits are the Footſteps of Chriſt. In their Diet,
'they forbid all manner of Milk, and whatſoever is made
'of it, and all that is procreated by Copulation. This
'is that which they oppoſe to us concerning their Con-
'verſation. As to the Sacraments, they conceal them-
'ſelves; yet did they openly confeſs to us, That daily

'at

'at their Tables, when they take their Meals, they, ac-
'cording to the form of Christ and his Apostles, do con-
'secrate their Meat and Drink into the Body and Blood
'of Christ, by the Lord's Prayer, to nourish themselves
'therewith, as being the Members and Body of Christ.
'But as for us, they say we hold not the Truth in the
'Sacraments, but only a kind of shadow, and Tradition of
'Men. They also openly confess, That besides Water,
'they baptized also with Fire and the Holy Ghost, and
'had been so baptized themselves; Alledging to this
'purpose the Testimony of St. *John* the Baptist baptizing
'with Water, and saying concerning Christ, He shall
'baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire: and in
'another place; I indeed baptise you with Water, but there
'stands one in the midst of you, whom you know not, who
'shall baptize you with another Baptism besides that of Wa-
'ter. And that this other Baptism, was to be performed
'by the Imposition of Hands they endeavoured to make out
'by the Testimony of St. *Luke*, who, in the *Acts of the*
'*Apostles*, describing *Paul*'s Baptism, which he received
'from *Ananias*, at the command of Christ, makes no men-
'tion of Water, but only of the laying on of Hands; and
'whatsoever else we find, whether in the *Acts of the*
'*Apostles* or in St. *Paul*'s Epistles, they apply to this Bap-
'tism; and they say, That every Elect (for so they call all
'those that are baptized amongst them) hath power to
'Baptize others whom they find worthy, and to conse-
'crate the Body and Blood of Christ at their Meals.
'For first by their laying on of Hands, they receive some
'of their Auditors into the number of Believers, and
'then they have leave to be present at their Prayers; un-
'til that, after having had sufficient tryal of them, they
'make them Elect. They contemn our Baptism, con-
'demn Marriage, but the reason, why I could not get out of
'them, either because they durst not own it, or rather be-
'cause they knew none.

We

We have here a very exact and circumſtantiate Deſcription of a Sect of Manichees, if we pleaſe to compare it with the account that has already been given concerning them. And though we find theſe Perſons ſomewhat different in their Opinions from the *Cathari*, yet notwithſtanding that they have put their name upon them, as if they alſo had been Manichees.

But *Evervinus* goes on further in theſe words, 'There 'are alſo ſome other Hereticks in our Country, who are al-'together different from theſe, by whoſe mutual Diſcord 'and Conteſts, they were both of them diſcovered to 'us. Theſe deny that the Body of Chriſt is made on 'the Altar, becauſe all the Prieſts of the Church are not 'conſecrated. For the Apoſtolical Dignity, ſay they, is 'corrupted, by engaging it ſelf in Secular affairs, and the 'ſitting in the Chair of *Peter*; yet becauſe it does not 'wage God's Warfare as *Peter* did, it has deprived it ſelf 'of the power of Conſecrating, which was ſo great in *Pe-*'*ter*; and what it has not it ſelf, the Archbiſhops and 'Biſhops, who live like Men of the World, cannot re-'ceive from it, *viz.* the power of Conſecrating others: 'To this purpoſe alledging theſe words of Chriſt: *The* 'Scribes and Phariſees ſit in Moſes's chair, *what therefore they* 'bid you do, that do. As if ſuch as theſe had only the 'power of preaching and commanding, but nothing more. 'Thus they make void the Prieſthood of the Church, 'and condemn the Sacraments beſides Baptiſm only, and 'this only in thoſe who are come to Age, who they ſay, 'are baptized by Chriſt himſelf, whoſoever be the Mi-'niſter of the Sacraments. They do not believe Infant 'Baptiſm, alledging that place of the Goſpel, *Whoſo-*'*ever ſhall believe and be baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* 'All Marriage they call Fornication, beſides that 'which is between two Virgins, Male and Female, quoting 'for this the words of our Saviour, wherewith he an-'ſwers the *Phariſees*: *What God hath joined, let no man ſe-*'*parate*: As if God did only join ſuch together, as he did 'our firſt Parents. As likewiſe thoſe words of our Saviour, 'which he ſpeaks to the *Jews*, in anſwer to what they objected

to

'to him, about the Bill of Divorce, *from the beginning it was not so*; and the following words, *Whosoever marries her that is divorced, commits adultery*; and that of the 'Apostle; *Let marriage be honourable to all, and the bed undefiled.*

'They put no confidence in the Intercession of the 'Saints; they maintain that Fasting, and other Afflictions which are undertaken for sin, are not necessary to 'the Just, nor to Sinners; because at what time soever the 'sinner repents of his sin, they are all forgiven to him; 'and all other things observed in the Church, which have 'not been established by Christ himself or his Apostles, 'they call Superstitions. They do not admit of any 'Purgatory fire after Death; but that the Souls as soon 'as they depart out of the Bodies do enter into rest, 'or punishment, proving it from that place of *Solomon*, '*Which way soever the tree falls, whether to the south, 'or to the north, there it lyes*: by which means they make 'void all the Prayers and Oblations of Believers for the 'deceased.

'We therefore desire you, Holy Father, to employ 'your care and watchfulness against these manifold 'mischiefs, and that you would be pleased to direct your 'Pen, against these wild Beasts of the Reeds, not thinking it sufficient to answer us, that the Tower of *David*, 'to which we may take our refuge, is sufficiently fortified with Bulworks, that a thousand Bucklers hang on 'the Walls of it, all Shields of mighty Men. For we 'desire, Father, that for the sake of us simple ones and 'that are slow of understanding, you would be pleased 'by your study, to gather all these Arms in one place, 'that they may be the more ready to be found, and 'more powerful to resist these Monsters. I let you know 'also, that those of them who have returned to our 'Church, told us, That they had great numbers of their 'perswasion, scattered almost every where, and that amongst them were many of our Clergy and Monks. 'And as for those who were burnt, they in the defence they 'made for themselves told us, That this their Heresie

'had

'had been concealed from the time of the Martyrs, until these 'times; and that it had been preserved in *Greece*, and 'some other Countries. These are those Hereticks who 'call themselves Apostles, having a Pope of their own; 'whereas the other despise our Pope, and yet own them-'selves to have no other besides him. These Apostles 'of Satan, have amongst them continent Women, (as they 'call them) Widows, Virgins, their Wives, some of 'which are amongst the number of their Elect, others 'of their Believers; as in imitation of the Apostles, who 'had power to lead about Women with them.

Farewel in the Lord.

This is the Letter of *Evervinus*, whence St. *Bernard* took occasion to refute these Hereticks, in his 65. and 66. Sermons upon the *Song of Solomon*. And indeed we find, that the beginning of his 65. Sermon contains a manifest allusion to the beginning of this Letter of *Evervinus*. St. *Bernard* chargeth them, in that Sermon, That though they believed the Gospel, yet did forbid swearing altogether, and that notwithstanding this Prohibition, yet they suffered their Disciples to forswear themselves to preserve the secret of their Religion, *pag.* 759. *Edit. Paris. A.* 1623. *p.* 760.

2. He supposeth that their endeavour to hide their Religion, was a sufficient token of its impurity, with respect to manners.

3. He accuseth them for rejecting the Authority of the Old Testament; though he seem to express himself doubtfully on that point, *ibid.* 1.

4 He accuseth them of rejecting St. *Paul*, though he confesseth, That this was not the judgment of them all, but only of some of them. *K. An forte nec Paulum recipitis? De quibusdam ita audivi; non enim inter vos omnes per omnia concordatis; etsi à nobis omnes dissentiatis.* Probably you reject *Paul* also: for so I have heard of some of you; for neither do you all agree amongst your selves, though you all differ from us.

5. He accuſeth them for falſly boaſting themſelves of their Chaſtity, as having Wives, with whom they lived, in the ſame Houſe, without being married with them, *ibid. M.* and without being either their Wives, Daughters, Siſters or otherwiſe of Kin to them. St. *Bernard*, who ſets them forth, as a ſort of People who were unblamable in their Carriage and Behaviour; yet triumphs over them in this point, accuſing them of giving offence to their Neighbour, *pag.* 761.

That which is very ſingular in this Refutation of St. *Bernard*, is,

1. That at the end of his Firſt Sermon, he gives a Deſcription of them from *p.* 762. B. in theſe terms, *Vile nempe hoc genus & ruſticanum, ac ſine literis & prorſus imbelle*, he relates their different Opinions as not certainly known; and after that, he undertakes to refute them, as if they deſerved to be refuted.

2. That he aſſerts they were divided, and yet owns that he knew nothing about them, but from the anſwers they had given to ſome Catholicks; or what he had learnt from thoſe, who were entred again into the Church. In all his firſt Sermon therefore, he inſiſts on theſe two points: the firſt is, That they concealed their Opinions, which was contrary to the behaviour of the Apoſtles. The other, That their dwelling with Women not married, was a proof of their Impurity. The good Father, whileſt he diſcourſed thus, did not conſider the rigour of the Perſecution they were under; and he had forgot that *Robertus* of *Arbriſſel* had practiſed the like continence with Women.

Goſrid. Vind. L. 4. Ep. 47.

In his ſecond Sermon, he lays down ſome part of their Opinions, and this he does like a Declamator; his firſt Sermon having been ſpent in invectives againſt them.

P. 762. 1. He chargeth them with condemning Marriage.

2. He ſets them forth as Idiots, and an ignorant ſort of People, but withal dangerous, as introducing again the Hereſies condemned by St. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 4.

P. 764. 3. He ſets upon their Title of Apoſtolical, as pretending that they had no Authors, and he only ſuſpects them of Manicheiſm; Though he ſeems to have freed them from that imputation

imputation before, when he ſays, *Quare cum illius ſectæ authórem neminem dabunt.* Wherefore ſince they can produce no Author of their Sect. p. 763.

4. He ſaith, That ſome amongſt them, allowed marriage only, where both the Parties were Virgins. p. 763.

5. He chargeth them with abſtaining from meats. *Horrent lac & quicquid ex eo conficitur; poſtremò quicquid ex coitu generatur.* 'They abhor Milk and all that is made 'of it; and laſt of all, whatſoever is generated by Co-'pulation. In which point he ſuſpects them of Manicheiſm p. 764.

6 He accuſeth them of conſecrating the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, at their common Tables: *Ad nutriendum ſe in corpus Chriſti & Membra*, to feed themſelves into the Body of Chriſt and Members. p. 765.

7. He accuſeth them of looking upon themſelves as the only Succeſſors of the Apoſtles. p. 765.

8. He accuſeth them of mocking at Infant-Baptiſm, Prayer for the Dead, and the Invocation of Saints.

9. He accuſeth them of detracting and ſlandring Eccleſiaſtical Orders, of rejecting Church-Ordinances, contemning the Sacraments, and diſobeying her commands, under pretence that the Popes, the Archbiſhops, the Biſhops and Prieſts were ſinners incapable of adminiſtring or receiving the Sacraments. p. 766.

10 Here he ſtops, as aſſerting that no body knows all their Opinions, and that there is no way of convincing them, becauſe they will not admit the Authorities which they do not underſtand.

11. He confeſſeth that they had been examined by Water, and found guilty. *Quæſiti fidem (NB.) cum de quibus ſuſpecti videbantur, omnia prorſus ſuo more negarent, examinati aquæ judicio, mendaces inventi ſunt: cumque jam negare non poſſent, quippe deprehenſi, aqua eos non recipiente.* 'When as they, after their manner, denied all things whereof 'they were ſuſpected, being examined by the Judgment of 'Water, they were found Lyers: and being no longer 'able to deny it, becauſe they were found guilty, by 'the Water not admitting of them, they confeſſed their

'Crimes, offered themſelves to defend them to the death, 'and were knockt on the head by the People, which St. *Bernard* finds fault with, as deſiring rather that the Magiſtrate might have put them to death by Law.

12. He removes the ſcandal, which their Conſtancy occaſioned, they dying like true Martyrs.

13. He pretends that the means of convincing them, is to oblige them to quit the Women they have with them, or elſe to leave the Church.

14. But for all this he obſerves, that they were ſupported by Princes, Biſhops and others, *propter quæſtum*, for their intereſt ſake, and who alledged it as reaſon, that they could not condemn perſons that were neither convict, nor confeſt their Crimes.

We may make theſe following Reflections on what St. *Bernard* ſaith concerning them.

1. That he ſpeaks of the ſame of whom *Evervinus* doth.

2. That he confounds them together, whereas *Evervinus* diſtinguiſhes them.

3. That the reaſon of their being reduced to diſſemble their true Opinions, was for fear of torments, and of being torn to pieces by the People.

4. That the Judgment of Water having been employ'd againſt them, they had very juſt cauſe of fear.

5. That their Diſtinction is evident enough from what St. *Bernard* himſelf ſaith of them, and that he confounded them by malice or by miſtake.

6. That their Confeſſions did not ſatisfie the Princes, nor the Biſhops themſelves.

7. That the Manicheiſm which he objected to them all, was not a true imputation to all of them, ſince it is true the Manichees drank not Wine.

8. That at laſt St. *Bernard* reduceth all to this, that he would have them puniſh by Excommunication in caſe they did not renounce the company of the Women they had with them.

Petrus Cluniacenſis has handled five Queſtions againſt the *Petrobuſians*, which bear a great reſemblance with the belief of the *Cathari* of *Italy*: but ſince the Diſciples of *Peter de Bruis* were ſeated in the Country of the *Albigenſes*, we ſhould confound matters by treating of them here. CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

A Continuation of the History of the Cathari *in* Italy, *as elsewhere, and their Distinction from the* Patarines.

MY Design is not to abuse my Reader's Patience, by setting down here all that I could observe relating to the History of the *Cathari*, from the Writings of several Authors of the XII. and XIII. Century, as of *Egbert* Abbot of *Schonauge*, *Alanus* of *Lisle*, *Giraldus Cambrensis*, and *Bonacursius*, who gives us an account of their Opinions, and of their settlement in the Dioceses of *Cologne*, *Gallia Narbonensis*, *Flanders*, and the Dioceses of *Milan*. Yet I cannot but represent to the Reader, that the Malice or Imprudence of these Authors, makes them ordinarily to confound those whom *Evervinus*, in his fore mentioned Epistle to St. *Bernard*, had with more care and honesty distinguished, and that whilst they writ the History of the *Cathari*, they had an eye to the *Patarines*, who had spread their Belief through all those places, and whom they design'd to make odious, by confounding them with the *Cathari*, that is to say, with the new upstart *Manichees*.

Egbert a Monk, and afterwards Abbot of *Schonauge*, tells us, that he had as often disputed with these Hereticks, as any of them were discovered amongst the People, so that he seems to be a Witness well informed in the case, though he owns that he had learnt more of their Opinions from those who had renounc'd them, that is, from those who by the force of Torments and Threats of being burnt, had abandoned their Belief.

He sets them forth as men famous by their Errors; 'These are they who are commonly called *Cathari*, a sort 'of People very pernicious to the Catholick Faith, which 'like Moths they corrupt and destroy. And yet he adds, That

That they were divided into ſeveral Sects, and maintain'd their Opinions by the Authority of Scripture. 'They are 'armed with the words of Holy Scripture, which any ways 'do ſeem to favour their Opinions, and with theſe they 'know how to defend their Errors, and to oppoſe the Ca-'tholick Truth; though indeed they be altogether igno-'rant of the right underſtanding that is couched in thoſe 'words, and which cannot be diſcovered without great 'judgment.

We may obſerve here, that this Title of *Egbert*'s Book doth not anſwer to the account *Trithemius* gives us of it in his Catalogue, who ſets down only theſe two words, p 897. *adverſum Hæreſes*, lib. 1. *Prophetatum dudum tempora*; whereas the Title of it contains a long deſcription of theſe *Manichean* Hereſies: *Adverſus peſtiferos fœdiſſimoſque Cathaorum (qui Manichæorum Hæreſim innovarunt) damnatos errores ac Hæreſes Egberti Presbyteri, primo Eccleſiæ Collegiatæ Bunnenſis, Colonienſis Diœceſeos Canonici, demùm verò profeſſi monachi* Schonaugienſis *monaſterii, utiliſſimi ſermones, ex penetralibus Evangelicis, & aliarum divinarum Scripturarum armario deprompti. Ex quibus proculdubio fructum plurimum metet diligens lector & candidus. Breve ex Auguſtino de Manichæis excerptum, per eundem Ecbertum.* Poſſibly *Trithemius* had no mind to trouble himſelf with quoting ſo prolix a Title, but certain it is, that neither *Reginald*'s Epiſtle, nor the firſt Sermon of *Egbert*, have the Beginning which *Trithemius* aſcribes to it: which may give us juſt cauſe of ſuſpicion, that either the Liſt they give us under *Egbert*'s Name, is none of his; or, that ſome part of it has been ſuppreſt, according to the laudable Cuſtom which is in vogue with the Roman Party in their publiſhing of Authors. Nor is it without reaſon they make uſe of this way, their zeal for the Romiſh Faith frequently obliging them to make uſe of pious Frauds, by hiding or diſguiſing the true Sentiments of thoſe Authors they publiſh.

But not to inſiſt upon this, he repreſents to us, firſt, the extent and ſpreading of the Doctrine of the *Cathari* throughout ſeveral places, as well as their different Names. *Serm.* 1. *p.* 898. *in Bib. PP. Colon. edit.* 'They are encreaſed to thoſe multitudes throughout all 'Coun-

'Countries, that the Church of God is in great danger of 'the Poiſon they ſcatter every where againſt her; for their 'words ſpread like a Cancer, and like a flying Leproſie, 'runs every way, infecting the precious Members of Chriſt. 'Theſe in our *Germany* we call *Catharini*, in *Flanders* they 'call them *Piphles*, and in *French*, *Tiſſerands*, from the Art 'of Weaving, becauſe a great many of them are of that 'Occupation. And as our Lord has foretold concerning 'them, they ſay Chriſt is in the inward Rooms, for they 'declare, that the true Faith and Worſhip of Chriſt is no 'where to be found, but in their Meetings, which they 'keep in their Cellars and Weaving-Rooms, and in ſuch-'like Dwellings under ground, they ſay they lead the lives 'of Apoſtles.

Secondly, He ſets forth to us their opinions, and the deſire they have to multiply their Diſciples; in which regard we muſt own that he deſcribes them as true *Manichees*, who abſolutely forbad Marriage, and all eating of Fleſh, who rejected Baptiſm with Water, and inſtead thereof, ſubſtituted a falſe one, *in ſpiritu ſancto & igne*, *With the Holy Ghoſt, and with Fire*; and who concerning the Euchariſt, entertained the notions of the *Manichees*, and who in particular maintain'd, that Souls were fallen Angels. But withal, we are to obſerve, that he attributes Opinions to them, that are very different from any thing of Manicheiſm, and which *Evervinus* attributes to another ſort of Hereticks, of whom he makes mention. p. 889.

De animabus mortuorum, talem ſententiam habent, quod in ipſa hora exitûs ſui, vel tranſeunt ad æternam beatitudinem, vel ad æternam damnationem. Non enim recipiunt, quod credit univerſalis Eccleſia, viz. eſſe quaſdam Purgatorias pœnas, in quibus animæ quorundam electorum, ad tempus examinantur pro peccatis ſuis, de quibus in hac vita per condignam ſatisfactionem ad plenum purgatæ non ſunt: Propterea ergo arbitrantur ſuperfluum & vanum eſſe pro mortuis eleemoſynas dare, miſſas celebrare, & irrident pulſationes campanarum, quas facimus, quo tamen piâ ratione in Eccleſias fiunt, ut videlicet vivi ad orandum pro mortuis commoneantur, & ad memoriam propriæ mortis excitentur. Miſſas quæ in Eccleſiis celebrantur, omnino ſpernunt, & pro nihilo ducunt.

cunt. Nam si fortè cum populo, in quo habitant, ad audiendum Missas, sive etiam ad percipiendam Eucharistiam accedunt, omnino hoc simulatorie faciunt, ne infidelitas eorum possit notari. Ordinem quippe sacerdotii in Rom. Ecclesia, & cunctis Ecclesiis Catholicæ fidei, omnino periisse dicunt, nec usquam nisi in secta eorum veros sacerdotes inveniri. 'Concerning the Souls of the dead, 'they hold this Opinion; That at the very instant of their 'departure out of the Body, they go to eternal Bliss, or 'eternal Damnation: for they receive not the Belief of 'the Universal Church, *viz.* That there are some Purga-'tory Punishments, wherewith the Souls of some of the 'Elect are tried, for some time, for those Sins from which 'they have not been purged by a plenary satisfaction in 'this Life. Wherefore also they account it superfluous 'and vain, to give Alms for the Dead, and celebrate Mas-'ses; and they scoff at our ringing of Bells, which yet for 'pious reasons are used in our Churches, to give others 'warning that they may pray for the Dead, and to put 'them in mind of their own death. As for Masses, they 'altogether despise them, and look on them as nothing worth; 'for if ever they accompany the People they dwell with 'to hear Mass, or to receive the Sacrament, they do this 'only dissemblingly, that their Infidelity might not be ta-'ken notice of; for they maintain, that the Sacerdotal Or-'der is altogether perished in the Church of *Rome*, and 'all other Catholick Churches, and that true Priests are only 'to be found in their Sect.

P. 899. Thirdly, He sets forth to us the original of these *Cathari*, which he pretends they derive from the *Manichees*, notwithstanding that he himself observes, that they were not all of the same opinions. These are his words: *Multa tamen permixta habent doctrinæ magistri sui, quæ inter hæreses illius non inveniuntur. Divisi etiam sunt contra semetipsos, quia nonnulla quæ ob aliquibus eorum dicuntur, ab aliis negantur.* 'Yet have they also many things mingled with their Ma-'ster's Doctrine, which we do not find amongst his Here-'sies. They are also divided amongst themselves; so what 'some of them say, is again denied by others. We may see from hence, whether our Author herein deals with that can-

dour

dour as he ought to do, when without distinguishing between the different Sects whereof he treats, he endeavours to prove them all to be *Manichees*.

1. From the Conformity of their Discipline, with that which Authors tell us was amongst the *Manichees*.

2. From the Conformity of their Opinions.

3. From the account he gives us of some Extracts out of St. *Augustin*'s Discourse on this Subject, with design to draw a comparison between the Opinions of these new *Cathari*, and those of old.

It seems to me to be very evident, either that this Author did out of malice confound these two Parties, against whom he disputes, which was avoided by *Evervinus*; or that he jumbled them together out of ignorance, upon pretence, that there was something of conformity in their Opinions, though they differ'd in their Principles, on which they founded their Opinions, the one drawing them as consequences from Manicheism, the other maintaining them upon other Principles opposite to the Church of *Rome*.

We ought to make this observation, with respect to those Authors who in the XII. Century have made mention of the *Cathari*, with this kind of confusion.

Ughellus tells us, in the Life of *Galdinus* Archbishop of *Milan*, that after he had persecuted them, during the eight or nine years of his Episcopacy, he died in the year 1173, by his over-vehement preaching against them. *Ripamontius* in his History of *Milan*, gives us the Sermon of *Galdinus* against the *Cathari*, whom he calls *Manichees* and *Arians*. But an indifferent Judgment will be able to discover, that that piece is of *Ripamontius*'s own forging, and consequently deserves no credit at all. *Ital. Sacr.* T. 4. p. 222.

D' Achery has published the Writing of an Author, who pretends to discover the Doctrine of the *Cathari*, of which he had been surely informed by the Conversion of one *Bonacursus* to the Roman Faith, who had been one of their Bishops, and had abjured their Doctrine. This Author makes three sorts of Hereticks, the *Cathari*, the *Passagii*, and the *Arnoldistæ*, whose Doctrines he refutes; but a wise Reader *Spic.* Tom. 13.

der will eaſily diſcern a great deal either of Ignorance or Malice in this Author,

He accuſeth ſome of theſe *Cathari* of maintaining Doctrines that are plain Manicheiſm; but then he jumbles others with them that are pure Arianiſm, and others again which ſeem to have been defended by the *Paterines*. I ſhall paſs by thoſe Doctrines that are wholly Manichean, as, That the Devil created the Elements; that he made *Adam*; that the Old Law was given by the Devil, &c. as alſo thoſe that are Arian, as, That Jeſus Chriſt is not equal with the Father. It is evident, that amongſt theſe he has mingled ſome, which were maintain'd by the *Paterines*, who were Enemies to the Romiſh Idolatry: As for example, That the *Cathari* maintain'd *Crucem eſſe characterem Beſtiæ, quæ in Apocalypſi eſſe legitur, & abominationem ſtantem in loco ſancto. Beatum Sylveſtrum, dicunt Antichriſtum fuiſſe, de quo legitur in* 2 Theſſ. 2. 4. *Epiſtolis, Filius perditionis eſt, qui extollitur ſuper omne quod dicitur Deus; à tempore illo dicunt Eccleſiam eſſe perditam.* 'That 'the Croſs is the Mark of the Beaſt; whereof we read in 'the Revelation, *and the abomination ſtanding in the holy place*. 'They ſay that bleſſed Pope *Sylveſter* was the Antichriſt, of 'whom mention is made in the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, as being 'the Son of Perdition, who extolls himſelf above every thing 'that is called God; for, from that time, they ſay, the 'Church periſhed. We ſee clearly from this paſſage, that he confounds the *Paterines* or *Waldenſes*, with the *Manichees*, that having been an Opinion of the *Waldenſes*, and not of the *Manichees*, as the Papiſts themſelves own.

He lays it down alſo as one of their Opinions; That 'the Law of *Moſes* is to be kept according to the Letter, 'and that the keeping of the Sabbath, Circumciſion, and 'other legal Obſervances, ought to take place. They hold 'alſo, that Chriſt the Son of God is not equal with the 'Father, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, theſe 'three Perſons are not one God and one Subſtance: and, 'as a Surplus to theſe their Errors, they judge and condemn all 'the Doctors of the Church, and univerſally the whole 'Roman Church. Now, ſince they endeavour to defend 'this their Errour by Teſtimonies drawn from the New 'Teſta-

'Teſtament and Prophets, I ſhall, with aſſiſtance of the 'Grace of Chriſt, ſtop their Mouths, as *David* did *Goliah*'s, 'with their own Sword.

He in particular ſets down their cleaving to the Old Law, in his firſt Chapter, wherein he ſeems better to underſtand the Scripture, than the Church of *Rome* did, whoſe Popes ſeveral Ages before this, impoſed great Penances on thoſe who had eaten the Fleſh of Beaſts dying of themſelves, or of Hens drowned in a Pit; as we may ſee in the Penitential Canons. p. 84.

He does not ſo much as once mention the *Arnoldiſts*; and we may take notice that his reaſon was, Becauſe their Opinions, as to many Articles, were the ſame with thoſe he had refuted in the *Cathari*. What I have already ſaid concerning this matter, may ſuffice; neither is it neceſſary to repeat the ſame here.

It is difficult to determine the time wherein this Author lived: *D' Achery* ſuppoſeth that he lived towards the end of the XII. Century: But the manner of his ſpeaking concerning the Four Doctors of the Church, of St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Gregory*, and St. *Auguſtin*, makes me judge, that he wrote later.

But not to inſiſt on this, we find, that *Alanus* attributes to the *Cathari* almoſt the very ſame Opinions, in his firſt Book againſt Hereticks which he wrote about the year 1192, and that under that general name which he gives them he comprehends a great number of Sects, who differ'd from one another in their Principles, ſome of them being *Manichees*, others *Arians*, and others again holding the Opinions of the Reformed or Proteſtants. Some of the Opinions of theſe later, you may ſee in what follows.

He affirms, that ſome of theſe Hereticks believ'd that Baptiſm is of no uſe to Infants, becauſe they were not guilty of any Sin. Ch. 39. And that others of them held, That it was of no uſe, but only to thoſe who were of age. Ch. 41. Others again, That it could not be of any advantage to either of them both. Ch. 43. He ſays that ſome of them held, That that Sacrament was of no uſe without the impoſition of hands.

I have, in one of the foregoing Chapters, made appear, upon what occaſion ſome of the Dioceſs of *Milan* fell into theſe Opinions concerning Baptiſm; which it is not needful to repeat in this place.

Chap. 47. He tells us, That ſome of them believ'd, that Penance was of no uſe after Baptiſm, and that they baniſhed all thoſe from their Aſſemblies that ſinned after they had been baptized. And that others were of Opinion, that

Ch. 50. Penance is of no uſe for the Remiſſion of Sins, becauſe that is a Work of Grace.

Ch. 52. He gives us an account of the Opinion of others of them, who maintain'd it was ſufficient for them to confeſs their Sins to God.

Ch. 57. He takes notice, that they rejected the Doctrine of

Ch. 59. Tranſubſtantiation; and that they condemned it, as being an Article that was not to be found in any Creed of the Church.

Ch. 66,67,68. He ſaith, There were others amongſt them that rejected Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction, pretending that they were no Sacraments of the Goſpel.

Ch. 69. That there were others of them that had no regard for Churches, and refuſed to own them for the Houſe of GOD.

Ch. 72. That they rejected the Invocation of Saints, and Prayers for the Dead.

I have given this account of the Imputations wherewith *Alanus* blindly chargeth the *Cathari*, for ſo he calls them, in his 63. Chapter, to evidence the ſottiſhneſs or malice of this Author: of his Sottiſhneſs we may take a ſcantling by the Etymology he gives us of the Name *Cathari*, for he maintains that they got that Name from their *kiſſing the hinder part of a Cat* in their Aſſemblies, the Devil appearing unto them under that form. We may judge of his ſtupidity by the contrary and contradictory Opinions which he heaps up together in the ſame Book, as if they had all of them been defended by the ſame Perſons. *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, *Arians*, all comes alike to him, as being Names very proper to render his Adverſa-

ries

ries whatſoever odious, whom he had a deſign to blacken to the utmoſt.

We may judge of his Malice by his jumbling ſo different Parties together, with deſign thereby to make a greater impreſſion upon the mind of his Reader. It is eaſie to perceive, that he ſets forth the Errors of the *Cathari*, with alluſion to the Opinions of the Church of *Rome*: She believ'd the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm, and ſhe held it for an Error either to deferr Baptiſm, as formerly had been practis'd, till they were grown up, as well as the Opinion of thoſe who condemn her exceſs in raiſing it to ſuch a degree of neceſſity as She does.

She believed the abſolute neceſſity of the Euchariſt; as we may ſee in the Synod of *Arras*, in the Life of *Hereticks*, and in *Alanus*; and he calls thoſe *Hereticks* who deny this Article of Faith concerning the Communion.

They were at that time ſetting up the Neceſſity of Confeſſion, and *Innocent* III. ſoon after eſtabliſhed it by the Canon, *Omnis utriuſq; ſexus, &c.* and yet in the mean time the Doctrine of Contrition, as reſtoring a Sinner to Grace and Favour, was ſtill in uſe. This is that which is own'd by *Mathoud in Pullum Cardinalem*, and by *Boileau*, in his Treatiſe of Attrition, and in the mean time they charge this Belief upon the *Cathari* as a Crime.

The power of declaring Remiſſion of Sin by a *Laick*, is of the ſame nature; the Church of *Rome* admitted of it, and there have been a Thouſand Examples of it in Shipwracks, and yet in them this is cenſured by *Alanus*, as an Error, becauſe they made uſe of it as an Argument againſt the abſolute Authority of the Prieſts.

It may be ſome will imagine, that it was *Alanus*'s Deſign to ſet upon the *Albigenſes* in his Firſt Book, as he makes it his buſineſs to attack the *Waldenſes* in his Second. And probably, the Biſhop of *Meaux* would not be wanting to make his obſervation, that conſequently the *Albigenſes* were meer *Manichees*; which will appear the more probable to him, firſt, becauſe he chargeth the *Waldenſes* only with ſome Controverſies of leſs importance, which they had with the Church of *Rome*, concerning Diſciplin.

Secondly,

Secondly, That writing to the Earl of *Montpellier*, he ſeems rather to have had an eye to the *Albigenſes*, than to the *Waldenſes*, whom he diſtinguiſheth from them, and ſets upon in his Second Book.

But here, firſt of all, we are to take notice, that the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes* had both of them the ſame belief, as I ſhall be able to juſtifie with God's aſſiſtance. Secondly, We are to obſerve, that his Deſign being to ſet forth the *Cathari* in their colours, without diſtinguiſhing them, as *Evervinus* and *Petrus Cluniacenſis* have done, he rak'd together all the Diſcourſes that had been made againſt them, without troubling himſelf about the examining of them. Thirdly, That ſince there were ſome *Manichees* in the Country of the *Albigenſes*, he made it his buſineſs to confound them with the true *Albigenſes*, in order to render them the more odious, and to draw down upon them the averſion and horror of his Readers, who were not of ſufficient capacity to ſearch into the nature of the Opinions which he attributed to them, nor into their connexion and incompatibility. Fourthly, We are to obſerve, that tho' he lays nothing to the charge of the *Waldenſes*, but Controverſies of leſſer importance in his Second Book; his reaſon for that was, becauſe he had already ſufficiently comprized them in the Firſt Book.

However, I ſhall preſently make it appear, that the difference between the *Waldenſes* and the Church of *Rome*, was not ſo ſmall, that they could be lookt upon only as Schiſmaticks, as the Biſhop of *Meaux* has been pleaſed to imagine; and that the reaſon why this Author thus divided his Book, was not to evince, That the *Waldenſes* held no other Opinions, differing from thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, but that he might range the Queſtions he deſigned to treat of under different Titles, whoſoever they might be, whom he was reſolved to write againſt. And for an evident proof, that this Obſervation is well grounded we may take notice, that *Gyraldus Cambrenſis* ſaith, That the Errors of the *Paterines* or *Cathari*, were principally about the Euchariſt. 'Tis in a MS. Treatiſe of his entituled, *Gemma Eccleſiaſtica*, where we find theſe words,

MS. in Bibl. Lambeth.

Dens

Deus itaque qui in omnibus operibus ſuis magnus eſt, & meritò magnificandus, in duobus hic præcipuè ſe magnificum oſtendit: quod in illis mundi partibus, in quibus Hæretici illi noſtri temporis, qui Patari ſeu Catari dicuntur, & circa hunc præcipuè articulum, ſcilicet de corpore Chriſti conficiendo, errare noſcuntur, ſcilicet in Flandriæ finibus, magis abundant, hoc declaravit. 'God therefore, who in all his Works is great, 'and worthily to be magnified, has in theſe two particu-'lars chiefly glorified himſelf by declaring this in thoſe 'parts of the World, *viz.* on the Borders of *Flanders*, in 'which thoſe Hereticks of our time, who are called *Pate-'rines* and *Catharines*, and who are known chiefly to err 'about this Article of making the Body of Chriſt, do moſt 'abound.

CHAP. XVIII.

That the Paterines *and* Subalpini *were not Manichees, as is evident from their Writings and from their Opinions in the Twelfth Century.*

AFter this that I have ſaid concerning the Manichees and the *Cathari*, it is the eaſieſt thing in the World to juſtifie thoſe called *Paterines* and thoſe *Subalpini*, that in the Dioceſs of *Turin* ſeparated themſelves from the favourers of the Roman Party, in imitation of the Clergy of *Milan*, who had their Meetings at *Pateria*.

It is clear enough, that all thoſe Authors I have cited to inform us of the Opinions of the *Cathari*, as of a ſort of *Manichees*, had in their proſpect many other pretended Hereſies whoſe they confounded purpoſely with the *Cathari* or *Manichees*, as ſoon as they perceived the leaſt Conformity between their Opinions and thoſe of the *Cathari*, to make them odious to the People by inſinuating to them that thoſe other

other who were ſeparated from the Church of *Rome* agreed in all, or almoſt in all with the *Manichees*.

But beyond that, we have a piece dated after the Year 1100. of our Lord, entitled *The Noble Leſſon*; which is in the publick Library of the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, given by Sir *Sam. Morland*, in the Year 1658. This MS. is very ancient, and in the body of this old Noble Leſſon we find theſe words:

Ben ha mil è cent ans compli entierament
Che fu ſcritta loro che ſon al' derrier temp.

That is, *Eleven hundred years are already paſt ſince it was writ, That we are in the laſt times.* Sir *Samuel Morland* gives it us at large in his Hiſtory of the Churches of the Vallies of *Piedmont*. *Lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 99. & ſeq.*

Thoſe who ſhall take the pains to read it, will find ſo much Piety and Purity as to matter of Faith in it, that they will hardly be able to ſuppoſe a Manichean the Author of it. The Author, upon ſuppoſal that the World was drawing to an end, exhorts his Brethren to Prayer, to watchfulneſs, to a renouncing of all worldly goods: He enforceth this conſideration by the uncertainty of Life, and the certainty of Death, by repreſenting to them the day of Judgment, wherein every one ſhall receive according to his Deeds, either good or evil. He lays down the belief of two ways, the one to Glory, for Good; the other to torment, for the Wicked, as an Article of Faith; and he proves it from a review of the whole Scripture beginning at the Hiſtory of the Creation, concluding, That ſmall is the number of thoſe who ſhall be ſaved.

He aſſerts, That the firſt Principle of thoſe, who deſire to do good Works, is to honour God the Father, to implore the aſſiſtance of his glorious Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, who enlightens us in the true way. He ſaith, That theſe Three are the Holy Trinity, full of all Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs. He bids us pray unto them for neceſſary aſſiſtance to overcome the World, the Devil and the

the Fleſh, to the end we may be able to keep our Bodies and Souls in the way of Charity.

He lays down, that to the Love of God we are to joyn that of our Neighbour, which comprehends the Love of our Enemies.

He ſpeaks of the hope the Believer hath of being received up into Glory.

He explains the original of Evil and Sin which reigns in the World, with reference to the Sin of *Adam*, which brought forth Death.

From whence he ſaith Chriſt has redeemed us by his Death.

He tells us, That Men do imitate *Adam*, in forſaking God, to believe in Idols.

He condemns the Adulteries, the Diviſions, and Pride that reign in the World.

He rejects the Opinion of thoſe, who ſay, That we ought not to believe, that God created Man to let him periſh, and proves the contrary; maintaining from the Old and New Teſtament, that only the Good ſhall be ſaved.

He ſets down all the Judgments of God in the Old Teſtament, as the effects of a Juſt and Good God; and in particular the Decalogue, as a Law given by the Lord of the whole World.

He repeats the ſeveral Articles of the Law, not forgetting that which reſpects Idols.

After having ſhewed the Judgments of God againſt the wicked Iſraelites, and his favour towards thoſe that were good amongſt them, he ſets forth the ſending of the Saviour into the World; the Angels meſſage to the Virgin; the Conception of Jeſus Chriſt by the Holy Ghoſt; the Virgins being betrothed, her Virginity; and laſtly, the Miracles at his Birth.

He proceeds to the Law of Jeſus Chriſt, which he declares to be nothing elſe but a renewal and perfecting of the old Law. That the Law only forbad Fornication and Adultery, but that the Goſpel forbids even wanton looks; that the Law gave way to Divorce, whereas the Goſpel forbids the marrying of one that is divorced, and for-

bids Divorce it ſelf; that the Law curſed thoſe who were barren, whereas the Goſpel counſels the keeping in a Single State; that the Law forbad all forſwearing of ones ſelf, whereas the Goſpel forbids us to ſwear at all, and that our words muſt be yea and nay. To this purpoſe he repeats almoſt all the Precepts of Jeſus Chriſt on the Mountain, wherein he hath explained the Law, and rendered it more perfect.

He had ſpoken before of the Inſtitution of Baptiſm by Jeſus Chriſt, and of the order given to his Apoſtles of baptizing all Nations. Afterwards he ſpeaks of the Miniſtry of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Apoſtles, of their Poverty, Sufferings, Doctrine, *&c.*

He exhorts to the Reading of Holy Scripture, to know the Laws of Jeſus Chriſt; as likewiſe to be informed that he was only perſecuted for his good works.

He obſerves, that his Perſecutors were the *Phariſees*, *Herod*'s Men and the Clergy, that he was betray'd by the Avarice of *Judas*, and that he died on the Croſs to ſave Men by the bitterneſs of his Sufferings.

He deſcribes the Circumſtances of the Death of our Saviour, his Wounds, his Burial, his Reſurrection, his ſhewing of himſelf to his Diſciples, his Aſcenſion into Heaven, his Promiſe to his Diſciples of being with them till the end of the World. He ſets forth the miracle of Pentecoſt, the preaching of the Apoſtles, after they had received the gift of Tongues, the manner of their Baptizing Believers, and the Perſecution of the Apoſtolical Church.

He compares the Perſecutors of old, who had not the Faith, with thoſe of his time. He denies that ever any of the Saints did perſecute, but that they were perſecuted by others.

He takes notice of the ſmall number of the Apoſtles, who were the only true Doctors, and compares their fewneſs with the ſmall number of the Believers and Miniſters of his time.

He

He gives a Character of the *Waldenſes* which is very remarkable; If a Man, ſaith he, who loves thoſe that deſire to love God, and Jeſus Chriſt, if he will neither curſe, nor ſwear, nor lye, nor whore, nor kill, nor deceive his Neighbour, nor avenge himſelf of his Enemies, they preſently ſay, he is a *Vaudés*, he deſerves to be puniſhed, and by lies and forging, ways are found to take away from him what he has got by his lawful Induſtry. In the mean time, ſaith he, ſuch a one comforts himſelf in the hope and expectation of eternal Salvation.

He mocks at the malice of thoſe, who ſuppoſed, that People whoſe life and behavour was contrary to that of the *Waldenſes*, might notwithſtanding be good Men and true Believers. He threatens them with Damnation, repreſenting to them, that a Death bed Repentance, and the Abſolution of a Prieſt, who does not cauſe Reſtitution to be made, but who goes ſnacks with the Penitent, promiſing him to ſay a Maſs for him, and for his Anceſtors, is of no avail.

He expoſeth ſuch Confeſſions and Abſolutions which were in vogue at that time.

He preciſely aſſerts, That from the time of *Sylveſter*, all the Popes, Cardinals, Biſhops, Abbots, *&c.* have falſely uſurped the power of Pardoning Sin, which belongs to God alone. He expreſſeth himſelf in terms of ſo much Energy, that I think my ſelf obliged to give the Reader a view of them.

For I dare ſay, and it is very true,
That all the Popes which have been from *Sylveſter* to this preſent,
And all Cardinals, Biſhops, Abbots and the like,
Have no power to Abſolve or Pardon
Any Creature ſo much as one mortal ſin;
'Tis God alone who pardons, and no other.
But this ought they to do who are Paſtors,
They ought to preach to the People, and pray with them,
And feed them often with Divine Doctrine;
And chaſtiſe the Sinners with Diſcipline,

Viz. By declaring that they ought to repent,
First, That they confeſs their ſins freely and fully,
And that they repent in this preſent Life,
That they faſt, and give Alms, and pray with a fervent Heart;
For by theſe things the Soul finds Salvation:
Wherefore we Chriſtians, that have ſinned,
And forſaken the Law of Jeſus Chriſt,
Having neither Fear, Faith, nor Love,
We muſt confeſs our ſins without any delay,
We muſt amend with weeping and repentance.
The offences which we have committed, and for thoſe three Mortal ſins,
To wit, for the Luſt of the Eye, the Luſts of the Fleſh, and the Pride of Life, through which we have done evil;
We muſt keep this way.
If we will love and follow Jeſus Chriſt,
We muſt have Spiritual Poverty of heart,
And love chaſtity, and ſerve God humbly,
For ſo we may follow the way of Jeſus Chriſt,
And thus we may overcome our Enemies.
There is a brief rehearſal in this Leſſon,
Of three Laws, which God gave to the World,
The firſt Law directeth Men who have Judgment and Reaſon,
Viz. To know God, and to pray to his Creator.
For he that hath Judgment, may well think with himſelf,
That he formed not himſelf, nor any thing elſe:
Then here, he who hath Judgment and Reaſon may know,
That there is one Lord God, who created all the World,
And knowing him he ought much to honour him;
For they were damned that would not do it.
The Second Law, which God gave to *Moſes*,
Teacheth us to fear God, and to ſerve him with all our ſtrength;

For

For he condemneth and puniſheth every one that offends.
But the Third Law, which is at this preſent time,
Teacheth us to love God, and to ſerve him purely:
For he waiteth for the ſinner, and giveth him time,
That he may repent in this preſent Life.
As for any Law to come after, we ſhall have none,
Save only to imitate Jeſus Chriſt, and to do his will,
And keep faſt that which he commands us,
And to be well forewarned when Antichriſt ſhall come:
That we may believe neither his words, nor his works;
Now, according to the Scripture, there are already many Antichriſts.
Many ſigns and great wonders
Shall be from this time forward until the Day of Judgment,
The Heaven and the Earth ſhall burn, and all the living die.
After which all ſhall ariſe to everlaſting life,
And all building ſhall be laid flat.
Then ſhall be the laſt Judgment,
When God ſhall ſeparate his People according as it is written,
To the wicked he ſhall ſay, Depart ye from me into Hell Fire, which never ſhall be quenched;
With grievous puniſhments there to be ſtraitened;
By multitude of Pains, and ſharp Torment:
For you ſhall be damned without remedy.
From which God deliver us, if it be his Bleſſed Will,
And give us to hear that which he ſhall ſay to his Elect without delay;
Come hither ye Bleſſed of my Father,
Inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the World,
Where you ſhall have Pleaſure, Riches and Honour.
May it pleaſe the Lord which formed the World,
That we may be of the number of his Elect, to dwell in his Court for ever.

Praiſed be God. Amen.

Now

Now I defie the impudence of the Devil himſelf to find therein the leaſt ſhadow of Manicheiſm. This Poem contains ſuch excellent and Chriſtian Leſſons, taken out of the Old and New Teſtament, concerning Faith, Prayer, Charity, Chaſtity, and all parts of Morality, that it may well be called a plain Extract of Scriptural Doctrine, ſuited to Perſons of mean capacity. We find therein alſo a refutation of ſome Errors of the Church of *Rome*, perform'd with ſo much exactneſs and ſolidity for a Work of that nature, that no Papiſt can imagine it to be any thing elſe but the Work of a true Chriſtian and Proteſtant: but ſince every one that will, may read it, it being tranſlated into Engliſh, without which, by reaſon of the obſolete Language, it would be difficult to be underſtood, I do not think it neceſſary to ſet down more of it here.

Only I think my ſelf bound to make ſome Remarks on this Tract, to prevent any difficulties that might poſſibly ariſe in the mind of the Reader.

We may obſerve, firſt, that this Poem, entituled, *The Noble Leſſon*, hath theſe words: 'That if there be an honeſt 'man, who deſires to love God, and fear Jeſus Chriſt, 'who will neither ſlander, nor ſwear, nor lye, nor commit 'Adultery, nor kill, nor ſteal, nor avenge himſelf of his 'Enemies; they preſently ſay of ſuch a one, He is a *Vau-'dés*, and worthy of Death. This name of *Waldenſis* was given to the Diſciples of *Peter Waldo*, as *Peter Vallis Cernaii* expreſly tells us in his Hiſtory of the *Albigenſes*, which being ſo, how can we ſuppoſe that this piece was wrote about the year 1100, which is above 70 years before the time wherein *Waldo* firſt appeared. This is the firſt Objection will be made againſt the Antiquity of this Poem.

The Second is, That the *Waldenſes* or Diſciples of *Waldo* having been particularly famous for their refuſing to ſwear, it ſeems that this Diſcourſe cannot be attributed to any but them, which if ſo, it would be concluded, that this Diſcourſe bears a falſe date, and is not of that Antiquity we pretend.

But

But it is eaſie enough to give a ſatisfactory anſwer to both theſe Objections. As to the firſt, we have this to ſay, That it is not true, that *Waldo* gave this name to the Inhabitants of the Valleys; they were called *Wallenſes* or *Vaudés*, before his time, from the Valleys in which they dwelt. This we find in *P. Damian*'s Letters, who calls them *Subalpini*, that is, the ſame as *Waldenſes*, and in *Ebrardus de Bethune*, who wrote in the year 1212, where he aſſerts, That they called themſelves *Wallenſes, quia in valle lachrymarum manerent, becauſe they abode in the Valley of Tears*: So that we ſee that this Etymology rather has reſpect to the place where they lived, which was in the Valleys of *Piedmont*, than to the name of *Peter Waldo*. *Antihær. c. 25.*

For the Second, I confeſs it would have been of ſome ſtrength in caſe the Diſciples of *Waldo* had been the firſt, that in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, had declared their averſion from Oaths: But we have clearly ſhewed from *Ratherius* Biſhop of *Verona*, and others, that this Opinion took place in that Dioceſs long before *Peter Waldo* was born; and beſides this, we know, that it was an ordinary thing amongſt the Primitive Chriſtians to forbid Swearing, upon any account whatſoever. There are ſome paſſages of Scripture, which ſeem ſo expreſs as to this point, That we need not wonder if the Chriſtians of that Dioceſs were led by them, eſpecially before they had examined the whole Scripture throughout, which was not an eaſie matter for them to do, the whole Body of Scripture being not yet tranſlated, that we know, but only ſome parts of it, and that by the Labour and Care of *Peter Waldo*.

I find nothing more that can rationally be objected againſt ſo expreſs a Teſtimony, which carries the date of the time inſerted in the body of the Treatiſe, but only this, which the Biſhop of *Meaux* ſeems to have had an eye to, *viz.* That the Language in which that Piece is written, ſeems to beſpeak it of a later date than the beginning of the XII. Century, the ſtile of it wholly agreeing with thoſe Treatiſes, that are confeſſedly of a more modern date, though they have been publiſhed as written in the year 1120, or, at leaſt, within the compaſs of the XII. Century.

To

To which I have two things to answer; the first is, That it cannot be thought so strange a thing, that some have attributed to the Pieces I have rejected, a greater Antiquity than really they had, as being found in MS. join'd to a Piece which signifies the date of its composure. This is a mistake very incident to such who are not perfectly well versed in the Critical Examination of MSS. But however, this cannot prejudice the Authority of a Book that bears its own date.

The Second thing I have to say in favour of the Antiquity of *The Noble Lesson*, is this: That though I cannot judge of the stile of that Piece, by comparing it with other *Italian* Monuments, of the beginning of the XII. Century, as having no MS. of that Age; nor compare it with the stile of those Ages that immediately followed it, in order to discern the difference between them: Nevertheless thus much we may assert,

First, That if they yet spake Latin in *Italy*, at the beginning of the XII. Century, as may be judged from this; That St. *Bernard*, who was a French man, spake without an Interpreter in the Churches of *Pisa*, *Milan*, and other *Italian* Churches, though indeed the Case of *Italy* was like that of other places, where, though the Latin Tongue were understood by most, yet the People had their particular Language they used amongst themselves: For *Peter Waldo*'s translating of the Bible, which must have been done before the year 1180, shews, That in *France* there was already a Language different from the Latin Tongue, and which was more commonly and generally understood: And, it would be easie for us to prove, that in like manner they had at that time in *Italy* a Language different from the Roman, distinguished into several Dialects, according to the distinct Provinces thereof, and much resembling the Language spoke in *Provence*, which ows its original to the *Limosine* Tongue, which is a corruption of the Latin. The Gentlemen of the University of *Cambridge*, who have in their Custody the MSS. of divers Pieces of the *Waldenses*, and amongst them an old MS. of some Books of the Old and New Testament, gives me a fair occasion

occasion to help the Reader to make this comparison, tho' I must confess it to be a thing of difficulty to accomplish, because although those MSS. of some parts of the Bible, are very ancient, it ordinarily happens, that in these sort of Books, which are for the use of the People, men from time to time reform and alter the stile, that so they may not sound uncouth and barbarous to the People, which cannot so well be done in a piece of Poetry, wherein nothing can be easily changed, without spoiling the whole composure.

I do not intend here, in order to prove the Opinions of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, to make use of a Catechism published by Sir *Sam. Morland*, and by *Leger*, as written about the year 1100, nor of another Treatise of the Invocation of Saints, which they pretend was written about the year 1120; my reason is, because it seems to me that that Catechism quotes the Scripture, as distinguished into Chapters, which was not till after the midst of the XIII. Century. And as for the Treatise concerning the Invocation of Saints, it quotes the *Milleloquium* of St. *Austin*, which was not compos'd by *Fr. Bartholomeus* of *Urbin* till about the midst of the XIV. Century. So that it seems these Gentlemen founded their Judgments of the Antiquity of these pieces on too weak grounds.

However, it will be easie for us to make out, without the assistance of any doubtful Authorities, That the XII. Century did not only preserve the Opinions of the *Paterines*, but also made them more clear and distinct; which will appear, if we examine the opinions of *Arnoldus Brixiensis*, as well as the writings of zealous Papists, against those whom they nicknamed *Cathari*, with design to make them pass for *Manichees*.

We may truly say, That scarcely any man was ever so defamed and torn, because of his Doctrine, as was this *Arnoldus Brixiensis*; Would we know the reason of it? It was because with all his power he oppos'd the Tyranny and Usurpation which the Popes began to establish at *Rome*, over the Temporal Jurisdiction of the Emperor. He was the man who by his Counsel renewed the Design of re-esta-

bliſhing the Authority of the Senate in *Rome*, and of obliging the Pope not to meddle with any thing, but what concern'd the Government of the Church, without invading the Temporal Juriſdiction. He it was that made the Senate and People of *Rome* ſend to the Emperor *Frederic*, to know his reſolution in the point, and to acquaint him with the Proceedings they had already begun againſt the King of *Sicily*, and the Pope, in order to reſtore *Rome* to the Emperors, and to make it the Head of the Empire, as it had been of old, without abandoning it to the Power of the Pope and his Clergy. This Letter is ſet down by *Otho Friſingenſis*.

De Geſtis Frid. lib. 1. c. 21.

This was his Crime, and this indeed is ſuch a one as is unpardonable with the Popes, if there be any ſuch.

As for the Qualifications of this *Arnold*, the ſame Biſhop *Otho* ſets him forth to us as a Man, who being but a ſimple Reader of the Church of *Breſcia*, for the love he bare to Learning travell'd into *France*, to be an Auditor of *Abelardus*, who at that time was the common Maſter of Learned men. He tells us, that upon his return to *Italy*, being endowed with happy natural parts, and a great eaſineſs of expreſſing himſelf, he behaved himſelf very regularly as to his Manners, and took upon him the habit of a Monk, as a mark of the love he had for Piety. This Truth, cannot be acknowledged more plainly and diſtinctly than it is by St. *Bernard*. *Otho* ſets him forth as a man loving ſingularity and novelty, and gives him a character very proper and agreeable to a Schiſmatick, and Heretical Ringleader. He grounds his Judgment upon this, becauſe upon his return into *Italy* he began to cenſure the Clergy, the Biſhops, and the Monks, and to ſeek the favour of Laymen. *Dicebat enim nec clericos proprietatem, nec Epiſcopos Regalia, nec Monachos poſſeſſiones habentes aliquâ ratione poſſe ſalvari. Cuncta hæc Principis eſſe, ab ejuſque Beneficentia in uſum tantum Clericorum cadere oportere.* 'For he 'maintain'd, that no Clergy-men enjoying Propriety, nor 'Biſhops having Regal Juriſdiction, nor Monks having any 'Poſſeſſions, could poſſibly be ſaved; that all theſe things 'belong'd to the Prince, and that it was only from his

Epiſt. 189, 195, & 196.

'Bene-

'Beneficence the Clergy were to partake of them. This ſame thing St. *Bernard* alſo reproacheth him with. Ep. 189.

Thoſe who have been a little converſant in the Hiſtory of the XI. Century, and the beginning of the XII, and who know the horrid diſſoluteneſs that then reigned amongſt the Clergy, and in Monaſteries, will find no great fault with him for theſe his Opinions. Thoſe who ſhall be pleaſed only to peruſe the Books of St. *Bernard*, *De Conſideratione*, to Pope *Eugenius* II, will eaſily acquit him of the Accuſations laid to his charge by *Otho Friſingenſis*.

But there was yet a more hainous thing laid to his charge, which was this: *Præter hæc de ſacramento Altaris, Baptiſmo parvulorum, non ſanè dicitur ſenſiſſe.* 'Beſides this, 'it was ſaid of him, that he was unſound in his Judg-'ment about the Sacrament of the Altar and Infant-'Baptiſm. And this was matter enough to condemn him; for as he thus induſtriouſly ſet himſelf to oppoſe the growing Errors in the Church of *Breſcia*, where he was born, being ſupported by *Maifredus* Conſul of that City; as *Ughellus* aſſures us, he was ſet upon by the Biſhop of *Breſcia*, and ſome other religious perſons, who accuſed him to the Council of *Rome*, under *Innocent* II, who impoſed ſilence upon him, leſt ſuch a pernicious Doctrine ſhould ſpread it ſelf any farther. *Otho* tells us, that hereupon he retired out of *Italy*, and ſetled himſelf in a place of *Germany* called *Turego*, or *Zurich*, belonging to the Dioceſs of *Conſtance*; as may be gathered from the 195. Epiſtle of St. *Bernard* to the Biſhop of *Conſtance*, where he continued to diſſeminate his Doctrine. *Otho* tells us, that he continued there till the Death of *Innocent* II, and that he came to *Rome* at the beginning of the Papacy of *Eugenius* II. which ſhews, that the Letter which St. *Bernard* writ to the Biſhop of *Conſtance*, did not much leſſen his Credit, or do him any great Prejudice. *Ital. Sacr.* T. 4. p. 740.

But we proceed to the upſhot of his Hiſtory, which take as follows, from the relation of the aforeſaid *Otho*.

'Being entred into the City, and finding it altogether 'in a ſeditious Uproar againſt the Pope, he was ſo far from 'following the Advice of the Wiſe Man, not to add Fewel 'to the Fire, that he greatly encreaſed it, propounding 'to the multitude the Examples of the ancient *Romans*, 'who by the maturity of their Senator's Counſels, and 'the Valour and Integrity of their Youth, made the whole 'World their own. Wherefore he perſwaded them to 'rebuild the Capitol, to reſtore the Dignity of the Senate, 'to reform the Order of Knights. He maintained, That 'nothing of the Government of the City did belong to 'the Pope, who ought to content himſelf only with his 'Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures. And ſo far did the Miſchief of 'this infectious Doctrine prevail, not only to the pulling 'down of ſeveral of the Roman Nobility and Cardinals 'Houſes, but alſo to the perſonal abuſe of ſome of the 'Reverend Cardinals, who were wounded by the raging 'Mobile. He could not think to eſcape long, after com-mitting ſo hainous a Crime againſt Perſons extreamly jealous of their Tyranny.

'And as he for many days, that is, from *Celeſtine's* 'death, to theſe times unceſſantly and irreverently pro-'ceeded in theſe and ſuch like Enterprizes, contemning 'the Sentence of the Clergy, juſtly and canonically pro-'nounced againſt him, as altogether void, and of no au-'thority: He fell at laſt into the hands of ſome, on the 'Borders of *Tuſcany*, who took him Priſoner, and being 'preſerv'd for the Princes Trial, he was at laſt, by the 'Prefect of the City hang'd, and his Body burnt to aſhes '(to prevent the fooliſh Rabble from expreſſing any Ve-'neration for his Body) and the Aſhes of it caſt into the '*Tyber*.

This was the End of this great man, which was a ſufficient Evidence of the veneration which the People of *Rome* had for him, whoſe Intereſts he had ſo couragiouſly undertaken to maintain againſt the Tyranny of the Popes, who without any Title or Right, except that of their Ambition, endeavoured to ſubject *Rome* to their Power, and to ſet up themſelves for Soveraigns there.

We

We find a Confirmation of all this in *Guntherus*, who in Verse has describ'd the Life of *Frederick*. Those who are never so little acquainted with History cannot be ignorant how furiously, for almost a whole Century, the Popes and their Partizans were engaged about the Right of Investitures, whereof they had a mind to deprive the Emperors: So that we cannot conceive a greater occasion of hatred in the Popes against any man, than was that which had set them against this *Arnold*, who stood up for the Emperor's Rights. But the Soveraignty of *Rome*, which they so much affected, and he so briskly opposed, fill'd up the measure of his Crimes, and some of the Emperor's men having taken him, probably out of complaisance to the Pope, sacrificed him to the Ambition of the Papacy. Lib. 3.

However thus much is certain, That this bloody Execution was very far from pleasing all men; as we may see from the Complaints *Gebehardus* makes upon that account, who lookt upon it as a crying piece of Injustice, the guilt whereof did lye upon the Bishop of *Rome*, and his Clergy, who were the Procurers thereof. The good man, it seems, was not over well inform'd, That the Church of *Rome* had studied the Art of Ruling, according to which, Crimes are not so narrowly to be sifted, as long as they do but serve to confirm the Pretensions of Ambition to the Soveraign Power.

Neither did this *Arnold* want Followers, who upon this occasion separated themselves from the Church of *Rome*; as may be seen by a Writing published soon after by *Bonacursus* Bishop of the *Cathari* of *Milan*, for this Author concludes his Work with a long Chapter against the *Arnoldists*, after he became a Convert. *Tom.* 13. *Spic.* p. 85.

In short, the pretended Error of *Arnoldus Brixiensis* was evidently against the Definitions of the Church of *Rome*: He had for a long time been the Disciple and Companion of *Abelardus*, whence we may conjecture, that he had also espoused his Opinions in the point of the Eucharist, and consequently, that he was very far removed from the Belief of *Rome*.

In-

Indeed, we find that St. *Bernard* ſending to Pope *Innocent* II. a Catalogue of the Errors of *Abelardus*, accuſeth him of teaching concerning the Euchariſt, that the Accidents ſubſiſted in the Air, but not without a Subject, and that when a Rat doth eat the Sacrament, God withdraws whither he pleaſeth, and preſerves where he pleaſes the Body of Jeſus Chriſt. This is found in a MS. of one of St. *Bernard*'s Epiſtles, and has been ſuppreſt by thoſe who cauſed his Works to be printed. But perhaps it will ſeem more probable, that this was rather a piece of Raillery, or Conſequence from the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, objected by *Abelardus*, than any poſitive Opinion of his. Thoſe who are acquainted with his *Genius*, and have read his Works, will judge hereof as I do.

After all, we have good ground to believe, that *Arnoldus Brixienſis* held the Opinions of *Berengarius*, as thoſe of *Italy* did, who renounced the Pope's Communion; for he abſolutely condemned the Miniſtry of the Church of *Rome*, as appears from the Book of *Bonacurſus* already quoted. Indeed it ſeems difficult to believe, That he ſhould have quitted the Opinion of his Country about the Euchariſt, whilſt he continued to be of their Opinion in that which was the moſt important and capital Article of all.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

That the Churches of Italy *were not founded by* Peter Waldo.

AFter all that I have before obſerved concerning the Original of the *Paterines* of their oppoſite Opinions to thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, the ſpreading of their Diſciples through ſeveral Countries of *Europe*; it appears very evident, that the keeping of the Truth in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, and particularly in the Dioceſs of *Turin*, and in the Valleys thereabout, was the Work of theſe *Paterines* and *Subalpini*, and that we cannot with any ſhew of Juſtice attribute the ſame to *Peter Waldo*. What kind of perſon this *Waldo* was, whether a ſimple *Laick* or a *Manichee*, will be of no concern to Churches which ſubſiſted long before him, under a Miniſtry diſtinguiſhed from that of the Church of *Rome*. Yet ſo it has happened by the malice of the Papiſts, in calumniating theſe Churches, and the inadvertency of divers Proteſtant Authors, that it is ſcarce poſſible fully to ſatisfie our Readers, without ſhewing what ſhare *Waldo* had in this Reformation, which is ordinarily attributed to him, becauſe it has pleaſed the Roman Party to denominate theſe Churches from *Waldo*, as if it was he who had firſt founded them. Whereas I affirm, that we are wholly beholden for this notion to the Papiſts, who made it their buſineſs to perſwade men, that before *Waldo* began to contradict the Biſhop of *Lions*, and to propound new Doctrines, which happened a little before the end of the XII. Century, there was never a Church either in *Italy*, or elſewhere, that was of his Belief. 'Tis for this reaſon they ſo much affected to fix the Name of *Waldenſes* on thoſe who were of his opinion. This we may ſee in *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud*, as well as in *Alanus*, who wrote before the end of the XII. Century. The Polemical

mical Writers of the paſt and foregoing Ages, have made uſe of this miſtake by a kind of preſcription againſt the Novelty of the Reformation. And as it ordinarily happens that men ſuffer themſelves to be caught by the Sound of Words, and by theſe kind of Prejudices, which are ſet forth with ſo much affectation, it cannot be denied, but that ſome Proteſtants, on this occaſion, have fallen into the Snare that was ſet for them.

Wherefore, that I may once for all clear this matter, I ſay, firſt, That it is abſolutely falſe, that theſe Churches were ever founded by *Peter Waldo* Let them ſhew us any Author of that time, who aſſerts, That *Peter Waldo* ever preached in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, or that he founded any Church there. Let them produce any ſure Tradition of that People, referring the Original of their Churches to *Peter Waldo*. Thoſe who wrote at that time do not tell us any thing like this, no more than they who lived after. Wherefore we muſt needs conclude it a pure Forgery to look upon *Waldo* as the Perſon who firſt brought the Reformation into *Italy*, we now find there. I own indeed, that by *Peter Waldo*'s taking care to have the Holy Scripture tranſlated into the vulgar Tongue, the Churches of *Italy* reaped much benefit from that Verſion, whereof we have to this day ſome old Copies in the Library of the Univerſity of *Cambridge*. But this does not in the leaſt inferr, That *Waldo* ought to be conſidered as the Founder of them. I ſay further, that by the acknowledgment of the Enemies themſelves of the *Waldenſes*, it is abſolutely falſe, that theſe Churches are of no older ſtanding than *Peter Waldo*. For this we have the Confeſſion of *Raynerus* an Inquiſitor, who lived before the middle of the XIII. Century. He ingenuouſly acknowledgeth, 'That the He-'reſie of thoſe he calls *Waudois*, or poor People of *Lions*, 'was of great Antiquity. Amongſt all Sects, ſaith he, '*cap.* 4. that either are, or have been, there is none more 'dangerous to the Church, than that of the *Leoniſts*, and 'that for three Reaſons; the firſt is, Becauſe it is the Sect 'that is of the longeſt ſtanding of any, for ſome ſay it 'hath been continued down ever ſince the time of Pope

'*Syl-*

'*Sylveſter*, and others, ever ſince that of the Apoſtles. The 'Second is, Becauſe it is the moſt general of all Sects; 'for ſcarcely is there any Country to be found, where this 'Sect hath not ſpread it ſelf. Now, it is clearer than the Sun, that *Raynerus* would never have talked at this rate, if he had known, that the firſt Riſe of this Sect was not above Seventy years before he wrote this Treatiſe; as we muſt acknowledge, if we ſuppoſe *Waldo* to be the Founder of it. It is alſo unqueſtionably plain, that it was impoſſible for a Sect to ſpread it ſelf ſo far and wide in ſo ſhort a ſpace of time.

The Biſhop of *Meaux* highly chargeth *Beza* for ſaying, That the *Waldenſes* time out of mind, had ſtifly oppoſed the abuſes of the Romiſh Church, and that they held their Doctrine from Father to Son, ever ſince the year 120. as they had heard and received it from their Elders and Anceſtors. He tells us, That the firſt Diſciples of *Waldo*, were content to alledge for themſelves, that they had ſeparated themſelves from the Romiſh Church, at the time when, under Pope *Sylveſter*, ſhe had accepted of temporal endowments and poſſeſſions. A pretenſion which the Biſhop of *Meaux* calls ridiculous, as well as the former. The Reader who has peruſed my Obſervations will be able to judge whether the *Waldenſes* did falſly boaſt of their Apoſtolical Antiquity. And as for that which was juſt now mentioned, that the firſt Diſciples of *Waldo*, did diſtinctly determine the date of their Separation from the Romiſh Church, to the Pontificate of Pope *Sylveſter*; I own with him that the Tradition is not founded upon any ſure proof. But however thus much may be ſaid to juſtifie the *Waldenſes*, That as they had no exact knowledge of Hiſtory, ſo it would be very unjuſt to charge this their ignorance upon them as ſome hainous Crime, at a time eſpecially when darkneſs covered the face of the Romiſh Church, and wherein the greateſt Doctors of that proud Communion, were no better than very Children in that point. But if we ſearch this matter to the bottom, who was it that firſt invented this Fable, that the Church was fallen into a

prodigious Corruption, upon occasion of the temporal endowments bestowed upon her at the time of Pope *Sylvester*? Is it not notorious that they were the Popes themselves, who caused the false Donation of *Constantine* to be published, which was made before the Year 850. to give themselves by this Forgery an ancienter title to what they held in *Italy*, than those late Donations of *Pepin* and *Charles* the Great, and thereby gave occasion to the dating the Corruption of the Church from the time of *Constantine*. Are the *Waldenses* so unpardonably guilty for having made this the date of their Reformation, since they never pretended to be great Criticks, and when they saw that the Church of *Rome*, and the Popes upon such a title, made it their only business to subject all the World to themselves, *per fasque nefasque*, right or wrong, which they pretended had been formerly bestowed upon them by *Constantine*?

V. Papebroch.

After all, the Bishop of *Meaux* knows well enough, that this Donation was made use of in the time of *Otho* I. to lessen the acknowledgement which was due to him from the Church of *Rome*, and that the same was inserted by *Gratian* in his Decree, before the middle of the Twelfth Century. Who are they that alledge this in their Disputes? Is it not the Church of *Rome* and her Partisans? If we doubt of it, we need only to read *Ebert's* Treatise against the *Cathari*, and we shall be fully convinced of it. He wrote about the Year 1160. And since the Dioceses of *Italy* was then already separated from the Church of *Rome*, their Posterity being deceived by the fraudulent pretences of the Papists, gave occasion to these honest People to conceit that their Ancestors first appeared in the time of *Constantine*. But pray, does not this pretension of theirs naturally suppose, that a long time before there was in *Italy* a body of Men separated from the Church of *Rome*, though for want of skill in History, they were ignorant of the exact time of their Separation from the Romish Party.

But

But in the mean time, will some say, sure it is that *Raynerus* gives the name of *Waldenses* to those of *Italy* against whom he writes. I confess he has done so, when he calls them *Leonists*; but we are also to take notice, that a more ancient Author whom *Raynerus* quotes, *viz. Tonson* the Monk, calls them *Paterines*. *Rayner. cap. 6.* which is sufficient to justifie their Antiquity, according to what we have made out in the foregoing Chapter.

I own, that sometimes the Churches of the *Valleys* have been denominated from *Waldo*, because he had a great number of Disciples, who joyned themselves with those who were already separated from the Romish Church; but I utterly deny once more, that ever they were absolutely called by the name of *Waldenses*, because he was the first founder of their Sect. This is that which I undertake to make out beyond all possible Contradiction.

1. These Believers of the *Valleys*, could not be so called from *Valdo* of *Lion*, because he did not flourish at the sooneſt till the Year 1160. according to *Roger Hoveden*, whereas the People of the *Valleys* of *Lucerne* and *Angrogne*, had the name of *Wallenses* from the beginning of the Twelfth Century. I have already made it appear, that they separated themselves from the Church of *Rome* long before, and that the name of *Wallenses* or *Vaudois* was given them from the place of their abode, which the inhabitants called *les Vaus de Lucerne & Angrogne*, that is to say, *The Valleys of* Lucerne *and* Angrogne, from whence came the *Latin* name *Vallenses*, which was afterward changed to *Valdenses*, when the design was laid to make Men believe, that *Valdo* was their first founder. This is that which I have made out from *Eberard de Bethune*, *cap.* 25. Moreover that they were called *Vaudois* before *Valdo*, is evident from the Poem which is called, *The Noble Lesson*, which is in the University-Library of *Cambridge*, which bears date *Anno* 1100. where they are so called.

2. I ſay, That *Waldo* could not poſſibly give them his name, till after he had been condemned by the Archbiſhop of *Lions*, which was not till about the Year 1172. by *John de Beauxmains*; if ſo be it were he that perſecuted them.

3. I ſay, That in the Council of *Lateran*, under *Alexander* III. in the Year 1179. they are not called *Vaudois*, but *Paterines*. True it is, that *Gualterus Mappeus*, who aſſiſted at that Council, where he diſputed againſt them, calls them *Valdeſii*, and ſpeaks of them, as if they had got that name from *Petrus Valdo*, who had been very famous amongſt them. But it is apparent that he did ſo only to abuſe them. Accordingly we find that the Canon of the *Lateran* Council ſpeaks only of the *Albigenſes*, though it is evident he beſtowed the ſeveral names upon them of *Cathari*, *Paterines* and *Publicans* only, to render them the more odious; either as having been Reſtorers of old Hereſies, or as correſponding with the Hereticks of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, or as being downright *Manichees*, which the term *Publican* implies, as we have had occaſion to obſerve elſewhere.

It may poſſibly be objected againſt what I have now ſaid, that divers Authors have maintained that *Peter Valdo* was the Author of the Opinions of thoſe who were called *Vaudois* in the Twelfth Century. This is that which is maintained by *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud*, publiſhed by *Gretſer* and by *Alanus*, in his Book againſt the *Vaudois*, dedicated to *William* Earl of *Montpellier*.

But I have Two things to anſwer, ſufficient to ſatisfie any equitable Reader: The Firſt is, That whereas this *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud*, who was of the Order of the *Premonſtré*, intitles his Book againſt the Sect of the *Vaudois* and *Arians*, he did not ſpeak ſo *pag.* 1198. *B. P. T.* 6. but by wilful miſtake: For 1. he calls them *Valenſes* in his Title, *Incipit Tractatus Bernardi contra Valenſes & Arianos*. The Title of *Valenſes* was their ancient name, taken from the place of their Habitation, and not from the name of *Waldo*. 2. That the reaſon which he had to make them *Waldo*'s Diſciples, was on purpoſe to have an advantage againſt

against them, from the Condemnation of their Doctrine by Pope *Lucius* III. We have this Condemnation in that Canon, *cap. ad abolendum decret. Grego. Lib. V. tit. 7. c. 9.* Whence it appears, that the Pope thereby pretended to condemn two sorts of Persons, who were equally opposite to the Church of *Rome*.

1. Those who were Schismaticks from that Church, and whom she had pretended to forbid the exercise of Orders, as judging that their Ministry could be no longer lawful or valid after such Prohibition.

2. Those whom she looked upon either as not ordained at all, or ill ordained; as deriving their Mission from those whom the Church of *Rome* had condemned: The words are these,

Imprimis Catharos & Paterinos, & eos qui se humiliatos vel Pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine, mentiuntur, Passaginos, Josepinos, Arnoldistas, perpetuo decernimus Anathemati subjacere. Et quoniam nonnulli sub specie Pietatis, virtutem ejus, juxta quod ait Apostolus, denegantes, authoritatem sibi vindicant prædicandi . . . . . omnes qui vel prohibiti, vel non missi, præter Authoritatem ab Apostolica sede, vel ab Episcopo loci susceptam, publicè vel privatè prædicare præsumpserint; & universos qui de Sacramento corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel de Baptismate, seu de Peccatorum Confessione, Matrimonio, vel reliquis Ecclesiasticis Sacramentis aliter sentire aut docere non metuunt, quàm Sacrosancta Ecclesia Romana prædicat & observat . . . . . vinculo perpetui Anathematis innodamus.

'In the first place we decree and judge that the *Catha-*
'*ri* and *Paterines*, and those who falsly take to them-
'selves the name of the Humble or Poor of *Lions*, lye
'under a perpetual Anathema. And forasmuch as some
'under the show of Piety, but denying (as the Apostle
'saith) the Power thereof, take upon themselves the Au-
'thority of preaching . . . . . whosoever are either prohi-
'bited or not sent, and nevertheless presume to preach,
'either privately or publickly, without any Authority de-
'rived from the Apostolick See, or from the Bishop of
'the Dioceſs: as likewise all those who are not afraid
'to entertain different Opinions, or teach otherwise con-
'cerning

'cerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our 'Lord Jesus Christ, or of Baptism, or the Confession of 'Sins, Matrimony or other Sacraments of the Church, 'than the Holy Church of *Rome* teacheth and observes: ... 'we do herewith bind under a perpetual Anathema.

What I assert doth further clearly appear from these other terms used by Pope *Lucius*, who though he maintains that the Heresies, which he mentions, were sprung up *modernis temporibus*, of late time, yet takes in with them the *Arnoldists*, whose rise was above 60. Years before that: *Arnoldus Brixienses* having been burnt at *Rome*, in the Year of our Lord 1155. as appears from Historians.

As for *Alanus*, it is apparent that he followed the same method.

1. He takes notice only of the *Albigenses*, against whom he writes, dedicating his Book to the Earl of *Montpellier*, under the Title of *Waldo*'s Disciples; and he seems extreamly pleased, that he had this their original to object to them, which as he supposed might serve for a Prescription, his Heresie having been condemned in the *Lateran* Council, *Anno* 1179.

2. 'Tis apparent that he pleased himself in confounding the Disciples of *Waldo*, who had caused the Old and New Testament to be translated, and had writ Explanations upon it, before the Year 1179. with the *Manichees*, who, we know rejected those Books. I shall elsewhere lay open the first rise and injustice of this Calumny.

So that all that can be said, with any certainty in this matter, is, That some of *Waldo*'s Disciples did probably joyn themselves with the Churches of the *Vallies* of *Piedmont*, being constrained thereto by the Persecution which dispersed them far and near. But withal it is most true,

1. That *Waldo* was not the founder of the Churches of the *Vallies*, which were in being long before him.

2. That it does not appear that he had any Communion with them: The Authors who speak of him, telling us, That he retired into *Flanders* and *Picardy*.

3. That

3. That he died before the year 1179, as appears from the account *Gulielmus Mappeus* gives us.

4. That the greateſt part of his Diſciples ſpread themſelves amongſt the *Albigenſes*, according to the Teſtimony of Hiſtorians, which *Albigenſes* were in being before *Waldo*, as may be ſeen by the 65. Sermon of St. *Bernard* upon the *Canticles*.

5. That thoſe of them that came into *Italy*, did not give their Name to the Churches of that Country, who before that were called *Wallenſes*, from the place of their abode, and that it was only the malice of their Enemies that made them paſs for the Diſciples of *Peter Waldo*.

CHAP. XX.

Whether the Waldenſes *were at firſt only* Schiſmaticks.

THE Biſhop of *Meaux* maintains, That the *Waldenſes* were a diſtinct Sect from the *Albigenſes*, whom he terms *Manichees*. He pretends that the Separation of the *Waldenſes* was for a long time no more than a Schiſm; 'Becauſe, ſaith he, when they firſt ſeparated themſelves 'from the Church of *Rome*, they had but very few Opi-'nions that were contrary to thoſe of that Church, or it 'may be, none at all. He pretends they owe their Riſe ſolely to *Peter Waldo* a Merchant of *Lions*, wherein he follows *Raynerius*, *cap.* 5. That the ſaid *Waldo* following the motions of a pious zeal, but ill informed, and being touched with the words of the Goſpel, where Poverty is ſo highly commended, perſwaded himſelf, that the Apoſtolical life was no longer to be found on the Earth, and therefore ſelling all that he had, reſolved to reſtore and renew it again: that this his example was imitated by many, who were touched with compunction. He afterwards accuſeth them

Lib. 11. *des variat.* p 213, 214.

them in the ſame Diſcourſe, affecting to live upon Alms, which made them at firſt to be taxed with oſtentation and affectation of a proud and idle Poverty. Afterwards he accuſeth them, in imitation of *Pilikdorph*, that having conſidered that the Apoſtles were not only poor, but Preachers alſo, they took upon them the Office of Preaching without Miſſion, from which being barr'd by the Biſhops and the Holy, they thence took occaſion to murmur againſt the Clergy, who oppoſed their Doctrine, as they ſaid, only out of Jealouſie, and becauſe their Doctrine and Holy Life caſt ſhame and reproach upon their corrupt manners. This being the original of their Schiſm, according to the Biſhop of *Meaux*.

Moreover he maintains, That *Waldo* was not a man of Learning, but that he had cunning enough to draw in perſons as ignorant as himſelf. He obſerves, that this Sect, which began now to encreaſe, was condemned by *Lucius* III, as *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud* aſſerts, who ſaw the beginnings of it, and who tells us, that this Condemnation happened before the year 1185.

Laſtly, He pretends that they denied none of the Doctrines which the Church of *Rome* teacheth; ſo that the Sect of the *Waldenſes* is a kind of Donatiſm. This is that the Biſhop of *Meaux* ſtrongly endeavours to prove, 1. By making it appear, that the firſt Conferences that were held with them, were about the Right they took to themſelves of Preaching without the Authority of the Biſhops, and againſt their Prohibition, and upon ſome other queſtions of the like nature. 2. Becauſe we do not find that ever they oppoſed either the Real Preſence, or the Sacrifice of the Maſs, nor the Sacraments of the Romiſh Church, nor any other of thoſe Doctrines which the Proteſtants do reject. That it was only about the year 1532, that they joined themſelves with the Proteſtants, and adopted the Opinions of the Reformation.

Now, foraſmuch as the Biſhop of *Meaux* has taken a great deal of pains in this matter, and that he pretends to have cited all the Authors that ſpeak of the manner of their Schiſm, and of the number of their Errors; it will be neceſſary to make a nearer

inſpection

inſpection into the matters he with ſo much confidence does aſſert.

And here it would be ſufficient to obſerve, 1. That all this is little or nothing at all to our queſtion. If the Biſhop ſhould prove, that ſome of *Waldo*'s Diſciples were only *Laicks*; yet would it not follow from thence, That the Churches of the Valleys, amongſt whom they retired, were nothing elſe but Aſſemblies of Laymen. We have made out the contrary concerning the *Paterines*, whoſe Separation from the Church of *Rome* laid the Foundation of the Churches of the Valleys. 2. That it is very evident from the Bull of *Lucius* III, whereof I have quoted ſome part in the foregoing Chapter, that the *Paterines* had divided themſelves from the Church of *Rome*, not only upon the Queſtions of Diſcipline, but alſo upon ſeveral other Queſtions concerning the Sacraments, and for which reaſon that Pope terms them Hereticks. So that it appears that the Biſhop of *Meaux* was ſo wholly bent to perſwade his Reader, that *Waldo* was the Founder of the Churches of *Italy*, that he has with all the care imaginable conceal'd from him, whatſoever might make him know that there were Churches in thoſe Valleys before *Waldo*.

But without engaging any further at preſent in that queſtion, whether the *Waldenſes* were only Laymen, it will be eaſie to convince the Biſhop, of the falſeneſs of all his pretenſions from thoſe very Authors which himſelf has produced on this occaſion.

I begin with the ſecond Article, becauſe on its deciſion depends that of the firſt, *viz.* Whether the *Waldenſes* did entertain any Opinions contrary to thoſe of the Church of *Rome*. It was not meerly from a Spirit of Schiſm that they ſeparated themſelves from the Church of *Rome*, tho' they did ſet forth the Corruption which reigned amongſt the Miniſters of that Communion; yet was it not this Corruption alone that was the motive of their ſeparation. But I don't intend to paſs by the firſt Article, as it is ſet down by the Biſhop, becauſe he took this way only to impoſe upon his Reader, though probably he alſo may have been impoſed upon, for want of due conſideration.

I maintain therefore, that the Notion which the Biſhop of *Meaux* gives his Reader concerning the *Waldenſes*, as if they had been only Schiſmaticks, is one of the falſeſt notions imaginable. I have made out, as may be ſeen by ſolid Proofs, that they oppoſed themſelves againſt the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, and that they made them the motive of their Separation. *Lucius* III. was well inform'd of this, when he condemned them, *cap. ad abolendum, pag. 97. Directorii. Conrard.* Abbot of *Urſberg*, ſpeaking of this Condemnation, acknowledgeth, *ad Ann.* 1212, That Pope *Lucius put them into the Catalogue of Hereticks, becauſe of ſome ſuperſtitious Doctrines and Obſervances.* Which are the very words that the Biſhop alledgeth. The ſame thing appears from the Edict of King *Alphonſus*, publiſhed in the year 1194. in execution of the Bull of *Lucius* III.

Pope *Innocent* III, in his Epiſtle, writ in 1198. plainly declares, That he took them for Hereticks, ſpeaking of the *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*, as being engaged in the ſame Doctrine. This Letter was directed to the Prelates of *South-France*, and to the neighbouring Biſhops of *Spain*, where the *Waldenſes* had a great number of Followers.

The Biſhop thinks to invalidate theſe Proofs by two means, that ſeem very plauſible; the one is, That *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud* relates a Conference held at *Narbonne*, at the end of the XII. Century, where only Four Articles were handled, which all of them referred to queſtions of Schiſm. The other is, That in the year 1212. the *Waldenſes* came to *Rome* to obtain the approbation of their Sect, which was refuſed them.

If the Biſhop had ſeen the Extract of *Mappens* publiſhed by the Learned Biſhop *Uſher*, he would not have failed to have made the ſame Reflections upon it, *Mappeus* obſerving that ſome of the *Waldenſes* were come to *Rome*, under *Alexander* III, in 1179, to ask leave of the Pope to preach, which was refuſed them.

But as to the Biſhop's firſt proof, he therein abuſeth his Reader; for we are to take notice, that this Conference was only about the Preliminaries, without entring upon the examination of the more fundamental Articles. Indeed

deed they were only ſome Prejudices urged againſt them, on purpoſe to hinder them from coming to the main points in queſtion; a method of preſcription, whereof the Romiſh Party have endeavoured to ſerve themſelves long time ſince, to ſtave off the Examination of thoſe Articles, which reproached and expoſed their corruption.

We know with what Impudence the Polemical Writers of the Church of *Rome* have employed this method againſt the Church of *England*, though they were ſufficiently convinc'd of the validity of their Miniſtry.

The other Reflection of the Biſhop of *Meaux*, about the buſineſs of theſe *Waldenſes* at *Rome*, under *Alexander* III, and afterwards under *Innocent* III, has no more ground than the former. The Decree of *Lucius* III. expoſed the Diſciples of *Waldo* to the Perſecution from the Emperor *Frederick* the I, who at that time gave up his Power to the Church of *Rome*. And the ſame was yet more rudely carried on under *Innocent* the Third. Whereupon ſome of this poor People looking upon the Pope, as the cauſe of all their Sufferings, thought they might either juſtifie their Innocence, by declaring their Opinions, in oppoſition to theſe their Adverſaries, who accuſed them of being no better than pure *Manichees*; or elſe be allow'd to preach by the Pope's general conſent, much like what we read often about thoſe times, that perſons that were already Prieſts, went to the Pope to obtain the liberty of preaching and wearing Sandals, which was then the mark of Preachers: But the refuſal that was return'd them, and the Pope's inciting Princes to wage War againſt the *Albigenſes*, and the Proceedings afterwards of Pope *Innocent* againſt them in the *Lateran* Council, in the year 1215, are ſufficient Arguments that they did not agree in their Doctrines about matters of Faith.

Neither indeed have the Popiſh Authors been backward in ſetting down the Errors wherewith they pretended they were chargeable. St. *Bernard*, in his 63. & 66. Sermon upon the *Canticles*, ſpeaking concerning the Hereticks, whom he calls *Cathari*, acknowledgeth, that they rejected Prayers for the Dead, as alſo thoſe addreſt to Saints. *Pamelius*

pretends, that he ſpake as plainly of the *Waldenſes* as any of thoſe that have writ ſince againſt them. But poſſibly, the Biſhop may not think theſe to be matters of Hereſie; at leaſt he ſpeaks very favourably of them in his Expoſition of the Roman Faith: Wherefore we ſhall make it appear, that they differ'd from the Church of *Rome* on other Articles.

Reynerius a *Jacobite* attributes to them 33 Errors, where-
Couſſord cont. Wald. p. 125. of *Couſſord*, has publiſhed an Extract in theſe words: *Hic fuit primus eorum error, contemptus Eccleſiaſtica poteſtatis. Ex hoc traditi ſunt Sathanæ, præcipitati ab ipſo in errores innumeros, & antiquorum hæreticorum errores ſuis adinventionibus miſcuerunt. Et quia electi ſunt ab Eccleſia Catholica, ſe ſolos Chriſti Eccleſiam eſſe, & Chriſti Diſcipulos affirmant. Dicunt ſe Apoſtolorum ſucceſſores, & habere auctoritatem Apoſtolicam, & claves ligandi ac ſolvendi. Romanam Eccleſiam ferunt eſſe Meretricem Babylonem, omneſq; illi obedientes damnari; maximè clericos ei obedientes à tempore Sylveſtri Papæ. Nulla miracula vera aiunt eſſe quæ fiunt in Eccleſia, quia nullus eorum aliquando miracula fecit. Omnia Eccleſiæ ſtatuta poſt Chriſti aſcenſionem, dicunt non eſſe ſervanda, nec alicujus eſſe valoris, feſta, feriarum jejunia, Ordines, benedictiones, officia Eccleſiæ & ſimilia reſpuunt omnino. Eccleſias conſecratas, Cœmeteria ac omnia talia infamant, & clamant ea pro avaritia ſolum à Clericis inſtituta, ut ea ad ſuum quæſtum reducant, quo à ſubditis hâc occaſione pecuniam & oblationes exquirant. Tum primò hominem baptizari dicunt, cum in eorum ſectam fuerit inductus. Quidam eorum Baptiſmum parvulis non valere tradunt, eo quod nondum actualiter credere poſſunt. Confirmationis ſacramentum reſpuunt: Sed eorum Magiſtri manus imponunt diſcipulis, vice illius Sacramenti. Epiſcopos, clericos, ac Religioſos Eccleſiæ, Scribas & Phariſæos aiunt eſſe, & Apoſtolorum perſecutores. Corpus Chriſti & ſanguinem verum eſſe ſacramentum non credunt, ſed panem benedictum, qui in figura quadam dicitur corpus Chriſti, ſicut dicitur, Petra autem erat Chriſtus, & ſimilia. Quidam autem hoc dicunt tantum per bonos fieri, alii per omnes qui verba conſecrationis ſciunt; hoc in conventiculis ſuis celebrant, verba illa Evangelii recitantes in menſa ſua, ibique mutuò participantes ſicut in cœna Chriſti. Dicunt quod peccator ſacerdos aliquem ſolvere aut ligare non poſſit; cum ipſe ſit ligatus peccator. Et quod quilibet*

quilibet bonus & sciens laicus alium absolvere valeat, & pœnitentiam injungere. Extremam unctionem respuunt, dicentes potius maledictiones esse quam sacramentum. Matrimonium, inquiunt, fornicatio est jurata, nisi continenter vivant, quaslibet enim immundicias magis licitas habent quam conjugalem copulam. Continentiam laudant quidem, sed inurente libidine concedunt ei satisfieri debere, quocunque modo turpi, exponentes illud Apostoli, Melius est nubere quam uri, quod melius sit quolibet actu turpi, libidini satisfacere, quam in corde tentari, sed hoc valde tenent occultum ne vilescant. Si aliqua honesta mulier, quæ casta putatur, puerum peperit, occultant & tradunt eum alibi alendum, ne prodatur. Omne juramentum illicitum esse perhibent, inde verò & mortale peccatum: Sed dispensant, ut juret quis pro evadenda morte corporis, ne alios prodat, aut secretum revelet perfidiæ suæ. Prodere Hæreticum, crimen esse dicunt inexpiabile, & peccatum in Spiritum sanctum. Nec malefactores per secula e judicium occidi licere dicunt. Quidam eorum nec Bruta Animalia, veluti pisces & hujusmodi, occidenda esse putant. Cum autem ea manducare volunt, super ignem & fumum suspendunt donec moriantur. Pulices & similia animalia excutiunt extra, aut vestem ipsam in aquam calidam intingunt, & tunc ea occidisse volunt, dicuntq; ea per se mortua fuisse. Ita fictas habent conscientias, & in aliis suis observantiis, sicut & in hoc existimari potest, quia scilicet veritatem deserentes, falsis se figmentis illudunt. Nullum est, secundum eos, Purgatorium. Omnes autem morientes statim vel in cœlum, vel in infernum transeunt: Ideoque & suffragia ab Ecclesia facta pro defunctis, nihil eis prodesse affirmant, cum in cœlo non indigeant, & in inferno nullatenus adjuventur. Unde colligunt oblationes pro defunctis factas, clericis qui illas comedunt prodesse, non animabus quæ hujusmodi non utuntur. Illorum dogma est, sanctos in cœlo orationes fidelium non audire, neq; venerationes, quas eos honoramus, attendere, quia cum corpora sanctorum hic mortua jaceant, & spiritus tam remoti sint in cœlo, orationes nostras nullo modo auditu percipere valeant vel visu. Addunt & Sanctos non orare pro nobis, & ob id suffragia illorum non esse implorandæ à nobis, quoniam cœlesti gaudio absorpti, nostris intendere, aut quid aliud curare non possunt. Unde & somnitates, quas in sanctorum veneratione facimus, irrident, & alia nobis eos veneramur. In diebus autem Festis (ubi possunt) occultè

ope-

*operantur, arguentes, quod cum operari bonum sit, bona agere in die festo, malum non est. In Quadragesima & die jejuniorum Ecclesiæ, non jejunant, sed carnes comedunt, ubi audent, dicentes, quod Deus non delectetur in afflictionibus amicorum suorum, cum sine his potens sit eos salvare. Quidam autem Hæretici affligunt se jejuniis, vigiliis, & hujusmodi, quia sine talibus Sanctitatis nomen apud simplices acquirere non possunt, nec eos simulationis figmento decipere. Vetus Testamentum non habent vel recipiunt, sed Evangelia, ut per ea non impugnentur, & se defendant, dicentes, quod superveniente Evangelio, vetera omnia sint abjicienda. Sic & verba Sanctorum Augustini, Jovini, * Gregorii, Chrysostomi, Isidori & autoritates eorum truncatas decerpunt, ut per ea sua figmenta approbent, aut resistant, vel etiam simplices seducant facilius, pulchris Sanctorum sententiis doctrinam sacrilegam colorantes. Illas autem sanctorum sententias, quas sibi vident contrarias, quibusque error eorum destruitur, tacitè prætermittunt. Dociles, inter alios complices & facundos, docent verba Evangelii, dictaque Apostolorum & aliorum Sanctorum in vulgari lingua corde formare, ut sciant & alios informare, & fideles allicere, ac demum suam sectam, pulchris Sanctorum verbis polire, quo salubria putentur quæ persuadent: Et ita per dulces sermones, seducunt corda innocentum. Non solum viri, sed & fœminæ eorum apud eos docent, quia fœminis magis patet accessus ad fœminas pervertendas, ut per eas etiam viros ipsos subvertant; sicut per Evam serpens illusit Adam. Verbis coopertis loqui docent, ne pro veritate studeant loqui mendacium; ut cum de uno requiruntur, de alio obliquè respondeant, & ita Auditores versutè deludant, præsertim ubi per Confessionem Veritatis, errorem suum timent deprehendi. Eadem simulatione Ecclesias nobiscum frequentant, intersunt Divinis, offerunt ad Altare, Sacramenta percipiunt, confitentur Sacerdotibus, observant Ecclesiæ Jejunia, Festa colunt, ac Sacerdotum Benedictiones inclinato capite suscipiunt: quamvis hæc omnia, & similia Ecclesiasticæ institutionis statuta irrideant, & prophana judicent & damnosa. Aiunt sufficere ad salutem soli Deo & non homini confiteri. Et eos qui Sanctis offerunt Luminaria, derident. Deinde sequitur in eodem Libro:*

Incœpit autem hæc Secta circa Annum ab Incarnatione Domini 1170 sub Joanne Bellomains Archiepiscopo Lugdunensi.

* Leg. *Hieron.*

Hæc

Hæc ſunt, Candide Lector, quæ ex antiquo libro membraneo, manuque ante ducentos nonaginta ſex annos, per prædictum fratrem Raynerium conſcripto, fideliter tranſcripſimus. Ex quibus videre eſt hanc Valdenſium Sectam, & præcipuas, penéque omnes (quæ nunc vigent) hæreſes, non recenter inventas fuiſſe, ſed ea-ante trecentos ſep uaginta ſex annos veniſſe in uſum. Quarum Autores poſtea (ut ſequitur) damnati fuerunt. 'This was 'their firſt error, a contempt of Eccleſiaſtical power: 'and from thence they have been delivered up to Satan, 'and by him caſt headlong into innumerable Errors, mix-'ing the erroneous Doctrines of the Hereticks of old, 'with their own inventions. And being caſt out of the 'Catholick Church, they affirm that they alone are the 'Church of Chriſt, and his Diſciples. They declare 'themſelves to be the Apoſtles Succeſſors, to have Apoſto-'lical Authority, and the Keys of binding and looſing. 'They hold the Church of *Rome* to be the Whore of '*Babylon*, and that all that obey her are damned, eſpecially 'the Clergy that are ſubject to her ſince the time of 'Pope *Sylveſter*. They deny that any true miracles are 'wrought in the Church, becauſe none of them did ever 'work any. They hold that none of the Ordinances of 'the Church, that have been introduced ſince Chriſt's 'Aſcenſion, ought to be obſerved, as being of no worth; 'The Feaſts, Faſts, Orders, Bleſſings, Offices of the Church 'and the like, they utterly reject. They ſpeak againſt con-'ſecrated Churches, Church-yards and other things of 'like nature; declaring that they were the inventions of 'Covetous Prieſts, to encreaſe their gains, by ſponging 'the People by this means of their Money and Oblati-'ons. They ſay, That then firſt a Man is baptized, when 'he is received into their Sect. Some of them hold, 'that Baptiſm is of no advantage to Infants, becauſe they 'cannot actually believe. They reject the Sacrament of 'Confirmation; but inſtead of that Sacrament, their 'Teachers lay their hands upon their Diſciples. They 'ſay, That the Biſhops, the Clergy and other Religious 'are no better than Scribes and Phariſees, and Perſecu-'tors of the Apoſtles. They don't believe the Body and

'Blood

'Blood of Chriſt to be the True Sacrament, but only 'Bleſſed Bread, which by a figure only is called the 'Body of Chriſt, in like manner as it is ſaid, and the 'Rock was Chriſt, and ſuch like. Some of them hold 'that this Sacrament can only be celebrated by thoſe that 'are good; others again, by any that know the words of 'Conſecration. This Sacrament they celebrate in their 'Aſſemblies, repeating the words of the Goſpel at their 'Table, and participating together, in imitation of Chriſt's 'Supper. They ſay that a Prieſt that is a ſinner, can-'not bind or looſe any one, as being himſelf bound: and 'that any good and knowing Lay-man, may abſolve an-'other, and impoſe penance. They reject Extreme 'Unction, declaring it to be rather a Curſe than a Sa-'crament. Marriage, ſay they, is nothing elſe, but ſworn 'Fornication, except the Parties live continently; and 'account any filthineſs more lawful than conjugal Copu-'lation. They praiſe Continence indeed, but in the mean 'time give way to the ſatisfying of burning Luſt, by any 'filthy means whatſoever, expounding that place of the 'Apoſtle, *'tis better to marry, than to burn*; thus, that it is 'better to ſatisfie ones Luſt, by any filthy act, than to 'be tempted therewith in the heart. But this they con-'ceal as much as poſſible, that they may not be re-'proached therewith. If any honeſt Woman amongſt them, 'that has the repute of Chaſtity, is brought to Bed of a 'Child, they carefully conceal it, and ſend it abroad to 'be nurſed, that it may not be known. They hold all 'Oaths to be unlawful, and a mortal ſin: yet they 'diſpenſe with them, when it is done to avoid Death, 'leſt they ſhould betray their complices, or the ſecret of 'their Infidelity. They hold it to be an unpardonable 'ſin to betray an Heretick, and the very ſin againſt the 'Holy Ghoſt. They ſay, That Malefactors ought not 'to be put to death by the Secular Power. Some of 'them hold it unlawful to kill brute Animals, as Fiſhes 'or the like; but when they have a mind to eat them, 'they hang them over the Fire or Smoak till they die. 'Fleas and ſuch ſort of Inſects they ſhake off their Cloaths,

'or

'or else dip their Cloaths in hot Water, supposing them 'thus to be dead of themselves. Thus they cheat their 'own Consciences in this and other observances. From 'whence we may see, that having forsaken Truth, they 'deceive themselves with their own false Notions. Ac-'cording to them there is no Purgatory; and all that 'die, do immediately pass either into Heaven or Hell. 'That therefore the Prayers of the Church for the Dead 'are of no use, because those that are in Heaven do not 'want them, neither can those that are in Hell be re-'lieved by them. And from hence they inferr, That the 'Offerings that are made for the dead, are only of use 'to the Clergy-men that eat them, and not to the 'deceased, who can't be profited by them. They hold, 'That the Saints in Heaven, do not hear the Prayers of 'the Faithful, or regard the Honours which are done to 'them; because their Bodies lye dead here beneath, and 'their Spirits are at so great a distance from us in Heaven, 'that they can neither hear our Prayers, nor see the Ho-'nours which we pay them. They add, That the Saints 'do not pray for us, and that therefore we are to entreat 'their intercession, because, being swallowed up with 'Heavenly joy, they cannot attend to us, or indeed to 'any thing else. Wherefore also they deride all the 'Festivals which we celebrate in honour of the Saints, 'and all other instances of our Veneration for them. Ac-'cordingly, whereever they can do it, they secretly work 'upon Holy days; arguing, That since working is good, 'it cannot be evil to do that which is good on a 'Holy-day. They do not observe Lent or other 'Fasts of the Church; alledging, That God does not de-'light in the afflictions of his Friends, as being able to 'save without them. Some Hereticks indeed afflict them-'selves with Fastings, Watchings and the like; because 'without these they cannot obtain the reputation of 'Holiness amongst the simple People, nor deceive them 'by their feigned Hypocrisie. They don't receive the 'Old Testament; but the Gospel only, that they may not be 'overthrown by it, but rather be able to defend them-

'ſelves therewith; pretending, that upon the coming of 'the Goſpel, all old things are to be laid aſide. In like 'manner they pick up the clipt words and authorities of 'the Holy Fathers, *Auguſtin*, *Jeronymus*, *Gregory*, *Chryſoſtome* 'and *Iſidore*, that with them they may ſupport their Opi- 'nions, oppoſe others, or the more eaſily ſeduce the 'ſimple, by colouring over their Sacrilegious Doctrine, 'with the good ſentences of the Saints: but at the ſame 'time they very quietly paſs thoſe places in the Holy Fa- 'thers, which oppoſe and deſtroy their errors. Thoſe 'who are teachable and eloquent amongſt them, they in- 'ſtruct to get the words of the Goſpel, as well as the 'Sayings of the Apoſtles and other Saints by heart, that 'they may be able to inform others, and draw in Be- 'lievers, and beautifie their Sect with goodly words of 'the Saints; that the things they perſwade and recom- 'mend, may be thought to be ſound and ſaving. Thus 'by their ſweet Diſcourſes deceiving the hearts of the 'Innocent. Neither do the Men only, but the Women 'alſo teach amongſt them: becauſe Women have an eaſier 'acceſs to thoſe of their own Sex to pervert them, that 'afterwards by their means the Men may be perverted 'alſo; as the Serpent deceived *Adam* by *Eve*'s means. 'They teach their Diſciples to ſpeak in hid and dark 'words, and inſtead of ſpeaking truth, to endeavour to 'ſpeak lies: that when they are asked about one thing, they 'might perverſely anſwer about another, and thus craftily 'deceive their Hearers, eſpecially when they fear that by 'confeſſing the Truth, they ſhould diſcover their errors. 'In the ſame diſſembling manner they frequent our 'Churches, are preſent at Divine Service, offer at the 'Altar, receive the Sacraments, confeſs to the Prieſts, ob- 'ſerve the Church faſts, celebrate Feſtivals, and receive 'the Prieſt's bleſſings, reverently bowing their heads. Thô 'in the mean time, they ſcoff at all theſe Inſtitutions of the 'Church, and look upon them as profane and hurtful. 'They ſay it is ſufficient to Salvation, to confeſs to God 'alone, and not to Man. After this, it follows in the 'ſame Book. Now this Sect began about the Year of our 'Lord's

'Lord's Incarnation 1170. under *John Bellomains*, Archbiſhop of *Lions*.

'This is that, Courteous Reader, which I have tranſcribed 'out of an old MS. Parchment Book writ 296. Years 'ago by Fryer *Rainerius*. From whence it appears that 'this Sect of the *Waldenſes*, and the chief, yea almoſt all 'Hereſies, which are now in vogue, are not of late in-'vention, but have continued already above 376. Years. 'Whoſe Authors afterwards, (as appears in the Sequel) 'were condemned.

Ivonet, in his *Summa*, *Part* II. *cap.* 2. accuſeth them of above Thirty Errors, as we find it recorded by *Pegna* upon the Directory of the Inquiſitors, *pag.* 280.

Æneas Sylvius, who flouriſhed in the Year 1451. makes a vaſt Catalogue of them, in his original of thoſe of *Bohemia*, who we know were a Colony of the *Waldenſes*, *cap.* 35.

Emericus, who lived in 1370. in his Directory, ſets down a Liſt of Twenty Errors of the *Waldenſes*, *part.* 2. *q.* 14. *pag.* 278. We find the ſame in *Bernard* of *Luxemburg*, who lived about the Year 1520. *Voce Pauperes de Lugduno & Paterini*, and in *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, who lived in 1530.

Claudius Couſſord, in the Year 1548. ſets down an Extract of *Raynerius*, *in Summa de Catharis & Leoniſtis*; and he follows his Text, in his Confutation of the *Waldenſes* and Proteſtants, as being almoſt the ſame. p. 126.

So *Albertus Cataneus* repreſents the Errors of the *Waldenſes*, as agreeable to our Opinions. *Hiſt. Caroli* 8. *p.* 291. *ad* 296.

Thus I have given, methinks, a ſufficient number of Witneſſes ſucceeding one another for 500. Years together, who all unanimouſly depoſed, That the *Waldenſes* were looked upon as Hereticks.

And yet notwithſtanding all this, the Biſhop of *Meaux* ſtifly maintains, That the *Waldenſes* never eſpouſed the Opinions of the Proteſtants, till after the Year 1532. at which time they united themſelves with them againſt the Church of *Rome*. Was there ever a more obſtinate piece of illuſion? *Claudius Seyſſelius*, Archbiſhop of *Turin*, wrote

againſt the *Waldenſes* before the Year 1518. He began his Pontificate by perſecuting them according to the Edicts of *Francis* I. and *Charles* Duke of *Savoy*. His Book was printed at *Paris*, in the Year 1520. in the firſt Pages of which Book he gives us an Account of the Sequel of their continual Perſecutions; He ſets down their belief, which is almoſt wholly conformable to their Confeſſion of Faith in 1532. and yet the Biſhop will needs ſtill confidently maintain, That all that Confeſſion was only the fruit of their uniting with the Proteſtants.

But however the Biſhop tells us, That they did believe Tranſubſtantiation, and ſo they cannot be looked upon as Schiſmaticks, ſuch as formerly were the Donatiſts. The Monſter of Tranſubſtantiation is ſo dear to the Romiſh Party, that it goes very hard with them to diſown thoſe, that own that. It ſeems as if at this day it was the Mark of Chriſtianity. Be accuſed of the worſt of Errors, yet if you do only believe Tranſubſtantiation, you you ſhall only paſs for a Schiſmatick. *Garnerius* the Jeſuit, makes it as great a Crime in *Neſtorius*, that he deny'd Tranſubſtantiation, as he pretends he did, as if he had overthrown the Myſtery of the Incarnation: and thus the Biſhop of *Meaux* ſeems only to conſider the *Waldenſes* as Schiſmaticks, becauſe, as he ſaith, they own'd that Doctrine. However we ſhall find that it will be very difficult for the Biſhop to make out this his Aſſertion by ſuch proofs as may be able to ſatisfie his Reader.

Firſt, What has he to ſay againſt that multitude of Witneſſes of his own Communion, who ſo plainly aſſert, That they rejected Tranſubſtantiation? I have but juſt now ſet down the Paſſages themſelves. If he accuſe them of having ſuffered themſelves to be deceived in ſo important an Article, what credit can their Teſtimonies deſerve, when they form againſt them ſuch horrid Accuſations upon other points? Truely we are obliged to the Biſhop, for furniſhing us with ſo good an anſwer, and we want only his Ingenuity to make uſe of it upon occaſion.

Secondly,

Secondly, What can the Biſhop ſay to the Confeſſions of Faith of the *Waldenſes*, wherein they formerly reject this Doctrine.

The Biſhop here offers two things, which ſway'd him, ſo eaſie is he to be determined by appearances. The one is, That it appears from the firſt Conferences that were held with the *Waldenſes*, as that of *Bernard*, Abbot of *Foncaud*, that they did not reject Tranſubſtantiation, becauſe no mention is made of it throughout the whole Diſpute, which the ſaid *Bernard* has pen'd very exactly. This he confirms by ſeveral Tryals of the *Waldenſes*, whereof the proceedings are in Mr. *Colbert*'s Library.

The other is, That it ſeems very probable, that the Confeſſion of Faith, printed in the Hiſtory of *Perrin*, is a late thing, and drawn up ſince the Reformation.

Nothing can be more impertinent than theſe Anſwers. If this way of arguing be good, it muſt follow, either that the *Waldenſes* have changed their belief ſince *Bernard*, Abbot of *Foncaud*, that is ſince the end of the Twelfth Century, until the Year 1250. or that *Raynerius* was a meer Slanderer.

It muſt alſo follow, that the Inquiſitors that examined them about this Article, as about an Article which the *Waldenſes* conſtantly rejected, were very Knaves, or Blockheads who underſtood nothing of the buſineſs of the Inquiſition.

But to ſpeak freely, the Inquiſitors deſerve but ſmall credit, if they ſpeak otherwiſe, than their Directory adviſeth, which they are to follow, as the Leſſon that is given them, for their Direction in the exerciſe of their Office: and I ſhall make it appear, as I go on, by giving a Scanſling of their honeſty and fair-dealing, how little cauſe the Biſhop had to rely upon them.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Concerning the State of the Church of Rome, *at the time of the Separation of the* Paterines *or* Waldenſes; *together with the Accuſations charg'd upon them by the ſaid Church, and the Idea they had conceived of her.*

THE account I have but now given from *Raynerius* and other Authors, who have made a Catalogue of the Errors of the *Waldenſes*, is abundantly ſufficient to refute the vain pretence of the Biſhop of *Meaux*, who ſuppoſeth that the *Waldenſes* were only Schiſmaticks. But foraſmuch as it is not unlikely but the Papiſts will diſown the Biſhop in this particular, as well as they do in ſo many others, it is but natural to endeavour to obviate the Objections they may frame againſt the Churches of *Piedmont*.

1. They will probably alledge, That the *Paterines* never accuſed the Church of *Rome* of ſo great a number of Errors, as the *Waldenſes* do.

2. They may ſay, That the *Waldenſes* were really guilty of a Multitude of Errors and Hereſies, which the Authors that I have cited after *Raynerius*, do unanimouſly charge them with.

3. They may probably take notice that the *Waldenſes* had an Article in their Belief, whereof we find no mention made in the reaſons alledged by the *Paterines* in Juſtification of their ſeparating from the Church of *Rome*, *viz.* That the *Waldenſes* declared the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Church of *Rome*, the Whore of *Babylon*, ſpoken of in the *Revelation*, which does not appear to have been any part of the *Paterines* Belief.

It will be an eaſie matter to ſatisfie any reaſonable perſon about the firſt of theſe Objections: and to this purpoſe, it will be of importance to conſider what was the State of the Romiſh Church, at the time when a part of the Dioceſs of *Milan*, with divers Biſhops at the head of them, were obliged to ſeparate themſelves from it. There is a fooliſh perſwaſion entertained by the generality of thoſe of the Romiſh Communion, that their Church has ever continued in the ſame State; whence they naturally inferr, as the Biſhop of *Meaux* does, That ſince the *Paterines* or *Waldenſes* did not at firſt reject all thoſe Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which in their later Confeſſions they have condemned; it may well be ſuppoſed they owned and profeſſed the ſame with that Church. How groſs a deluſion this is, will be eaſily made out by manifeſting that the Church of *Rome*, ever ſince the time of this Separation has declin'd from bad to worſe, and that the reaſon why the *Waldenſes* did not at firſt oppoſe all thoſe Doctrines which we at this day reject, was becauſe they were not as yet hatched, a great part of them being beholden to the ſubtilty of the Schoolmen for their Original, who were not in being at the time of their Separation; or becauſe the ſaid Doctrines were not looked upon by the Church of *Rome*, to be eſſential, as neceſſarily to require the Profeſſion or Practice of them from thoſe of her Communion.

The State of the Church of *Rome*, with reference to her Faith concerning the Articles, about which we conteſt with her at this day, will appear from the following Particulars.

1. She did not impoſe a neceſſity of equalizing the Authority of the *Apocrypha*, with the Canonical Books of Scripture. This inconteſtably appears from the Teſtimony of all her own Authors that have been ſince the Eleventh Century, to the Council of *Trent*, which firſt impoſed it. Accordingly we find the ſame diſtinction we make of Apocryphal and Canonical Books, in the writings of *Radulphus Giſelbertus*, *Rupertus*, *Honorius Auguſtod.* *Peter* Abot of *Clugny* againſt the *Petrobus.* *Hugo de Sancto*

Sancto Victore, *Richardus de Sancto Victore*, *Petrus Comeſtor*, Cardinal *Hugo*, *Nicolaus de Lyra*, *Brito* the *Franciſcan*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Joannes Semeca*, *Ocham*, *Hervæus*, St. *Antoninus*, *Toſtatus*, *Dionyſius* the *Carthuſian*, Cardinal *Ximenes*, Cardinal *Cajetan*, *Joſſe Clithou*, and in the writings of all thoſe who placed the *Prologus Galeatus* of St. *Jerome* before the Bible, though in divers Copies the word *Hagiographi* was put inſtead of *Apocryphi*, which word St. *Jerome* had attributed to Authors, whoſe Authority we reject, as ſome Papiſts have obſerved in their Editions.

The Church of *Rome* did not believe, That Tradition was a ſufficient ground to build Articles of Faith on, though the Second Council of *Nice* ſuppoſed it was only to maintain the Worſhip of Idols: as appears from the Account *Thomas Aquinas* has given us.

At that time indeed all the Faith neceſſary to be believed by a Chriſtian, was reduc'd to the Apoſtles Creed: *Leo* X. being the firſt who determined, that the Popes had power to make new Articles of Faith, as well as a new Rule of Manners. *In Bulla Exurge.*

The Reading of the Scripture was not forbid to Laymen until the Year 1200. *Innocent* III. *Epiſt. ad Metenſes.*

Councils were not believed to be infallible, though the Popes preſided in them. The Hiſtory of the Ages ſucceeding the Tenth Century, are filled with Examples that put this out of doubt. To this purpoſe the Reader may conſult the Treatiſe concerning the Unity of the Church, written by *Venerius*, Biſhop of *Verceil*, the Works of *Ocham*, upon the Depoſition of the Emperor *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, of *Peter d' Ailly*, *Æneas Sylvius*, and of many others, which will fully convince him of the Truth I aſſert.

It was not believed that the Chriſtians did merit any thing by their good Works, but perſons on their Death-beds were obliged formally to profeſs the contrary, in their laſt or Death-bed Confeſſions, as appears by the form preſcribed to that purpoſe by *Anſelm*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*.

Indulgences,

Indulgences, which came into requeſt ſome time after the Separation of the Dioceſs of *Milan*, were looked upon only as Pious Frauds. This was the Notion *Petrus Cantor* gave of them; and it is apparent, that till the Fourteenth Century, that which at preſent is owned to be the ground of them, was rejected. Jubilees were never heard of, until the time of Pope *Boniface* VIII. that is to ſay, in the Year 1300.

It was not believed, that notwithſtanding preceding Contrition, Abſolution was neceſſarily required, to obtain Remiſſion of Sins; but on the contrary, that Contrition for ſin was ſufficient to reſtore the ſinner to a ſtate of Grace.

It was not believed, that St. *James*, in the Fifth Chapter of his Epiſtle, ſpeaks of Auricular Confeſſion, neither indeed was there any uſe of Confeſſion, except in Publick Penances, which by little and little began to wear out of uſe after the Twelfth Century. And the neceſſity of confeſſing once a Year was not impoſed till the Year 1215. by Pope *Innocent* III. Neither was the neceſſity of the Prieſts intention believed at that time, as appears from the Writings of *Adelman* of *Brixia* againſt *Berengarius*, as well as by thoſe of *Petrus Damianus* and many others.

It was not believed that Marriage was forbid to Prieſts, otherwiſe than only by humane Conſtitutions; as may be ſeen in the Common Canon-Law of *Gratian*.

The Sacrament of the Euchariſt was not believed to be an Object of Adoration. We find nothing of it in all *Berengarius* his Diſputation: We Read alſo, that *Henry* II. King of *England*, adored the Croſs on his Deathbed, and that he received the Euchariſt with Reverence, but not a word of his worſhipping of it. And indeed the Decree whereby its Adoration was enjoin'd, is of no longer ſtanding than the Thirteenth Century. And even to this day the Deacon communicates ſtanding, according to the Ancient Cuſtom of the Greek and Latin Churches.

It was not believed, that the end and aim of the Real Preſence was to offer up Jeſus Chriſt in Sacrifice to God, for the ſins of the Living and Dead: *Lombard*, and the greateſt part of the old School-men, owning it to be no more than a Commemoration.

At that time there were but very few Churches, where they began to communicate under one kind only, *viz.* That of Bread; neither was this Cuſtom authorized, but by the Council of *Conſtance*, in the Year 1415. till which time almoſt all the Reflections of Papiſts upon the two kinds, are contrary to this abuſe, which *Henricus Gandavenſis* ſo highly exclaims againſt.

'Tis but ſince the Tenth Age that they began to place Images on the Altars, and indeed a good while after, and that in ſome Churches only.

Thiers Diſſert. P. 49.

'Tis but ſince *Lewis* IX. his time that the Conſecration of Images was brought in uſe, as may ſtill be ſeen in the Pontifical. *Gaufridus de Bello loco de vita Ludovic.* IX. *cap.* 36.

'Tis but ſince the Tenth Century, that the Croſs hath been ſet upon Altars, and we find no inſtance to make us believe that the Image of Jeſus Chriſt was at that time faſtned to it, as it is at this day. *Thiers cap.* 18.

The Office of the Virgin was not eſtabliſhed in the Weſtern Church till the Year 1195. by Pope *Urban* II. at *Clermont*, in a Council aſſembled there by him, as having been till then the effect only of a private or particular Superſtition.

Before the XII. Century, very few Foundations of Dirges or Maſſes for the Dead were heard of; but ſince that time the *Mendicant* Fryars have brought into vogue the Office for the Dead, vowed Maſſes, and Dirges or Maſſes for the Deceaſed, and have multiplied them to that exceſs, that it is impoſſible for them to ſatisfie the Obligations they take upon them of ſaying ſo many Maſſes.

For

For the multiplication of new Feſtivals of the Saints, we are beholden to the XV. Century; as may be ſeen in *Clamengis, lib. de novis Feſtivitat. non inſtituendis.*

The Confraternities are but a very late Invention, as M. *Thiers* owns, *pag.* 33. of his Diſſertation concerning the Quire of Churches.

Theſe are the Articles that were either wholly unknown, or not yet received in the Church of *Rome*; whence it is evident, That the *Paterines* or *Waldenſes* could not at firſt oppoſe them, and that it is no matter of wonder that they never ſet themſelves againſt them, but as from time to time they were admitted of by the Church of *Rome*, whoſe Corruptions encreaſed daily, which they take notice of in their laſt Confeſſions of Faith.

The great Controverſies therefore at that time, were theſe:

1. Whether the Miniſtry of the Church of *Rome* was a lawful Miniſtry, foraſmuch as *Simony* was the principal means of obtaining any Eccleſiaſtical Dignities in the *Weſtern* Church.

2. Whether it was neceſſary to be ſubject to the Pope, in order to be a Member of the True Church, which the Popes abſolutely pretended, having to that end invaded the Authority of almoſt all Metropolitans, that naturally were *Autocephali*, that is, ſubject to no Church Authority above themſelves out of their Dioceſs.

3. Whether the Popes had Power to annul the Miniſtry of the married Clergy?

4. Whether the worſhipping of the Saints, Relicks, Images, and of the Croſs, were lawful.

5. Whether the Belief of the Popes concerning the carnal Preſence of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, was a Belief founded upon Holy Scripture.

6. Whether the Belief of the Abſolute Neceſſity of Baptiſm was lawful.

7. Whether the Doctrine of Purgatory was Evangelical.

8. Whether Prayers for the Dead were a Religious Performance.

Now, if we will take the pains to examine a little the Queſtions that were agitated between the *Waldenſes* and the Church of *Rome*, we ſhall find them to be the very ſame with thoſe I have juſt now mention'd; except only, as I have before obſerved, that the ſaid Queſtions were afterwards multiplied proportionably to the Encreaſe of the Romiſh Corruptions.

As to what concerns the Calumnies wherewith ſome have endeavour'd to disfigure them, and to make them the Horrour and Deteſtation of People, we may truly averr, That in this particular the Church of *Rome* has only conſulted her paſſion and hatred, without the leaſt regard had to Truth, or their Innocence.

The Learned *Uſher*, and divers others, have placed the Innocence of the *Waldenſes* in ſo clear a light, as to all the matters whereof they are accuſed, that I ſhould abuſe the patience of my Reader, by endeavouring anew to make their Apology. It ſhall ſuffice therefore to obſerve, firſt, That the Doctors of the Romiſh Church have maliciouſly affected to faſten upon the *Waldenſes* the Belief of the *Manichees*, under pretence, that the *Manichees* alſo oppoſed ſome of the Romiſh Practices, as well as the *Waldenſes*. Secondly, That to this purpoſe they have attributed to the *Manichees* ſeveral Doctrines of the *Waldenſes*, which do not in the leaſt partake with Manicheiſm. This a judicious Reader may eaſily perceive, by comparing the Catalogue of the Errors of the new *Manichees*, drawn up by *Emericus*, which I have ſet down, *Chap.* XV. with their Opinions, as they are reported to us by St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Auſtin*, *Theodoret*, and by *Peter* of *Sicily*, in the IX. Century.

I acknow-

I acknowledge, it may ſeem ſtrange to ſome to find the *Waldenſes* ſo conſtantly charged with ſuch groſs Calumnies; but here I muſt deſire the Reader to conſider,

1. That it is no great Sin with the Church of *Rome* to ſpread Lyes concerning thoſe that are Enemies of the Faith.

2. That the Church of *Rome* has been alwaies deſirous of preſerving the Reputation of her ancient Authors, as being ſome of their greateſt Saints, which would viſibly have been diminiſhed, if not quite loſt, in caſe their Succeſſors ſhould have own'd the Innocence of the *Vaudois* Churches. No, 'tis a far more eaſie and convenient way to aſſert, That the *Waldenſes* have chang'd their Belief, than to accuſe their Saints of having been moſt infamous Calumniators.

3. That the greateſt part of thoſe Authors, who have writ concerning the Hereſies of the *Waldenſes* or *Vaudois*, have only followed their firſt Leaders, *viz. Alanus* and others, without troubling themſelves to enquire into the Truth of the matter: Which is the very character of thoſe ſort of Compilers.

4. That after the account *Emericus* has given us in his *Directory of the Inquiſitors*, they of the Church of *Rome* were no longer at liberty to embrace a different repreſentation of their Belief from what he had already given, People generally being ſo far engaged in an high eſteem for the Inquiſition, and their exactneſs in all proceedings, that they would have look'd upon it as a great Crime, to change their Judgment in a matter they had allow'd of and eſtabliſh'd: Neither indeed could it be done without incurring the danger of falling into their hands; for we may well ſuppoſe they would never ſuffer their Credit and Sincerity to be in the leaſt queſtioned.

5. That there is nothing more common with the Romiſh Party, than to make uſe of the moſt horrid Calumnies to blacken and expoſe thoſe who have renounced her Communion. The Proteſtants in *France* were at firſt accuſed of committing the ſame impurities at their Meetings, which the Heathens objected to the Primitive Chriſtians, and the Papiſts ſince that to the *Waldenſes*. And if we caſt

an

an eye upon what *Sigebert* tells us concerning the *Greeks* of the XI. Century, we ſhall find that Calumny is a Trade the Romiſh Party is perfectly well vers'd in. *Leo* IX. ſaith he, ſent his Legates to *Conſtantinople*, to refute the Hereſies of the *Greeks*, who like *Simoniacks*, ſold the Gift of God; like the *Valeſians*, took their Gueſts and gelt them, and ſo promoted them to Biſhopricks; like the *Arians*, they re-baptized the *Latins*, that had already been baptized in the Name of the Holy Trinity; in imitation of the *Donatiſts*, they boaſted the Orthodox Church to be only in *Greece*; like the *Nicolaitans*, they allowed Marriage to Prieſts; like the *Severians*, they declared the Law of *Moſes* to be accurſed; like the *Pneumatomachi*, they cut off the Belief of the Holy Ghoſt from the Creed; like the *Nazarenes*, they obſerved Judaiſm, forbidding little Children, though at the point of death, to be baptized before the Eighth day; and Women in danger of life, by reaſon of their Travail, or Courſes, to communicate; or, if they were Heathens, to be baptized: That they called the Latins *Azymita*, and perſecuting them, ſhut up their Churches; that they ſacrificed with leaven'd Bread, and anathematized the Roman Church in her Children, preferring the *Conſtantinopolitan* Church before her. But notwithſtanding all this, if we will believe *Leo Allatius*, there was but a very little difference between the Roman and Greek Church at that time.

6. We are to take notice, that notwithſtanding the fury and malice of the Romiſh Party, in wounding the Reputation of the *Vaudois*; yet there have not been wanting ſome Hiſtorians, in the Boſom of that Church, who have been ſo generous as to own the Truth. *Paradin* obſerves in his *Annals* of *Burgundy*, That he had ſeen ancient Hiſtories, that fully juſtified them from all the Accuſations laid to their charge, and made it appear, That their only Crime was, their declaming againſt the profligate Manners and Conduct of the Roman Clergy. *Thuanus* has ſeconded him herein, as well as divers other Authors of the Roman Communion, who have wrote ſince the Reformation, and ſufficiently acquit-

acquitted them of all those horrid Calumnies, which for so long a time have been made use of to run them down.

I proceed now to the last Article before mentioned, *viz.* the Idea which the *Vaudois* had conceived of the Church of *Rome*: Certainly it is a very surprising thing to see the *Vaudois* treating the Pope with the Title of *Antichrist*, and of the *Apocalyptical Beast*, and the Church of *Rome* with that of the *Great Whore*, and *Mystical Babylon*. What ground had they to speak and write at this rate? for we find that this was the common stile they made use of in their Disputes with the Romish Party. This is a matter well worth our consideration.

Emerick in his Directory attributes this Opinion to those he calls the new *Manichees*: but to speak truth, he is wholly besides the matter, and either abuseth himself, or has a mind to deceive others; for it was the Opinion of the *Vaudois*, and not of the *Manichees*, and they had the strongest motives so to do, that Persons who made it their chief business to read the Scripture, could propose to themselves: motives, I say, which from time to time were fortified and confirmed by the continual encrease of the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

1. There have not been wanting a great number, in the Bosom of the Church of *Rome*, who conceiv'd and publickly propos'd this notion, since the time of *Gregory* VII. *Wolfius* has set down several of their Writings on this Subject, which it is not necessary to transcribe here.

2. We find that the *Vaudois* had with great exactness applied themselves to the study of the *Revelation*; and the Treatise they have published about this matter, long time before the Reformation, sufficiently evidenceth, that they had compared the Characters St. *John* speaks of, with those which they found in the Pope and his Church.

3. We find that in the said Treatise they make a more particular Reflection upon three things which star'd in the Eyes of all men, since the XII. Century; the first was the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*; the other was the Power the Popes had usurped over almost all the secular Powers

Powers of *Europe*; and, the third was, the fury and violence of the Perſecution the Church of *Rome* employ'd to ſupport her Tyranny, her falſe Doctrine and Worſhip, and to cruſh whatſoever did in the leaſt offer to oppoſe it ſelf againſt her Uſurpation.

1. The Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, which had ſuffer'd a great ſhock at the Council of *Francfort* in 794, but notwithſtanding, that ſtill encreaſed every day, and more eſpecially after that the darkneſs of the X. Century had forc'd Piety to give way to Idolatry and Superſtition. The Violation of the Second Commandment was very apparent, but could be no longer palliated or diſguiſed after that ſome Popes in the XII. Century began to renew in their Canonizations, which began about that time, the Pattern of the Pagan Apotheoſes. This Deification of Men is ſo horrid an attempt againſt the Chriſtian Religion, that it may well be look'd upon as the top and higheſt degree of Idolatry.

2. The method the Popes took to make themſelves Maſters of all *Europe*, almoſt all the Kings thereof ſubjecting their Crowns to the Pontifical Mitre. They who will take the pains to conſult the *Annals* of *Baronius*, about this point, will find, that ſcarcely was there ſo much as one State left in *Europe*, which had not declared it ſelf the Pope's Vaſſal, before the year 1200. He endeavours to confirm this Truth by the publick acts he produceth, concerning the Kingdom of *Arragon*, *Portugal*, *Caſtile*, and all *Spain*, as alſo of *Corſica*, *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, and the other Provinces of *Italy*, of *Provence*, *Low-Britany*, and whole *France*, of *Denmark*, *Saxony*, *Bohemia*, *Dalmatia*, *Croatia*, *Hungary*, *Poland*, *Muſcovia*, *England*, and *Ireland*. Hereupon we may make this obvious and natural reflection: The Chriſtians alledge againſt the Jews a very convincing Argument. It was foretold of old, That the *Meſſiah* was to convert the Nations to the Worſhip of the God of *Iſrael*, this being accordingly accompliſhed by Jeſus Chriſt: It follows, that he indeed is the *Meſſiah*, to whom this character is given by the antient Oracles; and by an Argument *à pari*, we inferr thus; The Kings that were to ſucceed to the Ruines of the Roman Empire

Empire have given their Kingdoms to the Pope; wherefore the Pope must needs be he whom St. *John* has mark'd out to us by the Beast, to whom the Kings were to submit their Authority. Now, as the Jews must make all Christians to renounce the God of *Israel*, whom they own and acknowledge, before they can suppose that the *Messiah* is to convert all the Heathens, and be known to be the *Messiah* by this distinguishing character; in like manner must the Papists snatch out of the Pope's hands all the Kingdoms that he hath, and doth possess, at least, as Lord Paramount, in order to make way for the appearance of Antichrist, and for his being own'd to be such.

3. The violence of the Persecution She has managed throughout all the parts of *Europe*, and whereof the poor *Vaudois* alwaies met with the greatest share. The Popes, who had enslav'd to themselves all the Western Churches, being Masters of the Temporal also, by the voluntary subjection of its Emperors and Princes, did no longer think of keeping any measures. The Bishops being almost generally subject to them, they made them decide in their Synods, whatsoever they pleased. The new Laws they made, were only the fruit of their Humours and Interest, and the Princes being now become their Vassals, were the ready Executioners of the Papal Violence and Fury, against those they had anathematiz'd.

Now it is certain, first. That since the X. Century, wherein *Arnulphus* Bishop of *Orleans* called the Pope Antichrist, in a full Council at *Rheims*, nothing has been more ordinary, than to give him this Title. The Antipopes of the XI. Century very lavishly bestowed it upon one another. This Example was followed in the XII. Century, and has never since been discontinued till the time of the Reformation, a vast number of Writers having set themselves against the Pope and the Papacy, openly proclaiming him to be the Antichrist, and his Church the Great Whore, and Mystical *Babylon*. *Balens* takes notice of a great number of these in his Centuries, with reference to *England*; and *Wolfius* hath instanced in many others belonging to the other parts of the Western Empire: More especially we ought to take

notice of what *Rupertus* Abbot of *Tuits* tells us, in his Commentary upon the Apocalypse, that Cruelty and Persecution were one of the most expres characters of Antichrist. See here what he writ at the beginning of the XII. Century, upon these words of the Apocalypse; *and cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast, should be put to death. Ita Christus non facit neq; prophetæ ejus, neq; Apostoli docuerunt, neq; Reges Christiani jam facti, hoc acceperunt ut occiderent & sanguine cumulandum existiment Christi servitium; verus namq; Deus non coacta sed spontanea servitia vult. Ergo & in hoc, in hoc maximè palam faciet sensum habentibus, quod verè sit Antichristus, quod verè non Christus, sed secundum nomen suum Christo sit contrarius. Hic est Christus qui sanguinem suum fundit; hic est Antichristus qui sanguinem fundit alienum.* In *Apoc. lib.* 3. *cap.* 13. 'Christ does not do so, neither did his Pro-'phets or Apostles teach so, neither have the Kings that 'are Christians received any such instructions to kill men, 'or to make them think, that the Worship of Christ is to be 'stained with Blood; for the true God doth not desire 'any forced, but voluntary Service. Wherefore by this 'mark especially will he make it evident to all that have 'any understanding, That indeed he is the Antichrist; 'that indeed he is not Christ, but according to his Name, 'opposite and contrary to Christ. He is Christ that sheds his 'own Blood, he is Antichrist that sheds the Blood of others.

After all this, I leave it to any one to judge whether it were an easie matter for the *Paterines* and *Vaudois*, being oppresst by the Pope and his Instruments, at the rate they were, not to form this Idea of the Pope and his Church, and whether any can think it possible, they should not instruct their Descendants, to have that just Horrour for the Church of *Rome*, which has alwaies hindred them from reuniting with her, notwithstanding all the ways of violence She has made use of to oblige them to it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

Concerning the Belief and Conduct of the Waldenſes *in* Bohemia.

NOW, becauſe the *Waldenſes* being driven into *Bohemia*, have continued there ſeveral years, it is but reaſonable for us, with ſome attention, to take a view of the ſtate of thoſe Churches. This, as on the one hand it will give us a juſt Idea of the Purity of that Spring, from whence this Rivulet was ſupplied with Water; ſo on the other hand, it will be uſeful to clear them from thoſe Calumnies wherewith the Biſhop of *Meaux* has endeavoured to overwhelm them, in his Treatiſe concerning the Proteſtant variations. An equitable Reader will be able to make his judgment from hence, Whether the Proteſtants have any reaſon to be aſhamed to own the ancient *Waldenſes* to be their Predeceſſors; and whether the Church of *Rome* did well in rejecting and deſpiſing the Advices and Remonſtrances of theſe their Cenſors.

We have two famous Authors, who can inform us concerning the Faith and Converſation of the *Waldenſes* in *Bohemia*; the one is an Inquiſitor, who wrote in the XIV. Century, towards the end of it, *Who*, ſaith he, *had an exact knowledge of the* Waldenſes, at whoſe Trials he had often aſſiſted, and that in ſeveral Countries; as himſelf witneſſeth. *Hiſt. Script. Bohem.* p. 222. *& ſeq.*

The other is *Æneas Sylvius*, who came to be Pope *Pius* II, in his Hiſtory of *Bohemia*, *Chap.* 35. where he gives us an exact deſcription of them, as having been himſelf on the place, and had ſeveral Conferences with them, and deſiring to inform a Cardinal concerning them.

The first of these has borrowed a good part of *Raynerus* his Treatise, who wrote in *Lombardy* about the year 1250, which shews, that they had the same Opinions at the end of the XIV. Century, which their Ancestors had in *Lombardy* about the middle of the XIII. The thing that is singular in this Author, is this, Not only that he prosecutes the same way of calumniating them upon many Heads, which is the way of Inquisitors against pretended Hereticks; but that he hath annexed to every Article of the *Waldensian* Opinions, concerning the Doctrines or Practices of the Church of *Rome*, the occasion that induc'd them to embrace such Opinions; which is a thing well worth our consideration, since we shall learn hereby, that the *Waldenses* had very exactly considered and weighed the Doctrines and Practices of that Church. I am resolved to lay down these their Opinions; for as the proofs which the good Inquisitor alledgeth to defend the Opinions of his Church, they are for the most part so extravagant, that the meanest Polemical Writer of this Age amongst Papists, would think it an affront to his own judgment to make use of them.

The first general Head of the Errors of the *Waldenses*, is said to be of *their Blasphemies against the Church of* Rome, *her Practice, Statutes, and her whole Clergy.* Their Errors (saith he) are distinguished into three parts; the first is, of their Blasphemies, wherewith they blaspheme the Church of *Rome*, her Practice, Laws, and whole Clergy. The second part of their Errors is, about the Sacraments of the Church, and the Saints. The third part is, concerning their Abhorrency of all the good and laudable Customs of the Church.

Their first Error, which comes under the first general Head, is, 'That the Church of *Rome* is not the Church 'of Jesus Christ, but an Assembly of ungodly men; and 'that She has ceased from being the true Church, from 'the time of Pope *Sylvester*, at which time the Poison of 'Temporal Advantages was cast into the Church.

2. 'That

2. 'That all Vices and Sins reign in that Church; and 'that they alone live righteously.

3. 'That there is scarce any one to be found in the 'Church, that lives according to the Gospel Rule, besides 'themselves.

4. 'That they are the true *poor in Spirit*, who suffer Per-'secution for the Faith, and Righteousness sake.

5. 'That they are the true Church of Christ.

6. 'That the *Eastern* Church doth not value or regard 'the Church of *Rome*; and, That the Church of *Rome* is 'the Whore in the *Revelation*.

7. 'They despise and reject all Ordinances and Statutes of 'the Church, as being too many, and very burthensome.

8. 'That the Pope is the Head and Captain of all 'Errour.

9. 'That the Prelates are the *Scribes*, and seeming religious 'Pharisees.

10. 'That the Pope, and all his Bishops, are Murthe-'rers, by reason of the Wars they foment.

11. 'That we must not obey Prelates, but God alone, '*Acts* 4.

12. 'That none in the Church ought to be greater than 'any of their Brethren, according to that of St. *Mat.* *But* '*ye all are Brethren.*

13. 'That no man ought to kneel to a Priest; *Rev.* the 'Angel saith to St. *John*, *See thou do it not.*

14. 'That Tythes are not to be given to Priests, because 'there was no use of them in the Primitive Church.

15. 'That the Clergy ought not to enjoy any temporal 'Possessions, *Deut.* *Neither the Priest, nor any of the Tribe of* 'Levi, *shall have any inheritance with the Children of* Israel, *the* '*Sacrifices being their portion.*

16. 'That neither the Clergy nor Religious ought to en-'joy any Prebends.

17. 'That Bishops and Abbots ought not to enjoy any 'Regalia.

18. 'That neither the Land nor People ought to be divi-'ded into Parishes.

19. 'That

19. 'That it is an evil thing to endow and found Churches 'and Monaſteries, and that nothing ought to be left to 'Churches by Will. That there ought to be none a Tenant 'to the Church. And they condemn all the Clergy for 'their Idleneſs, telling them they ought to work with their 'hands as the Apoſtles did. They reject all the Titles 'of Prelates, as Pope, Biſhop, *&c.* That no Man ought 'to be compell'd by force in matters of Faith. They con-'demn all Eccleſiaſtical Offices, and look upon them as 'Null and Void. They deſpiſe the Priviledges of the 'Church, and diſregard the immunity of the Church, and 'of Perſons and Things belonging to it. They con-'temn Councils and Synods, and ſay, That all Parochial 'Rights, are only Inventions. And that all the Obſer-'vances of the Religious are nothing elſe but Phariſaical 'Traditions.

'As to the ſecond Part of their Errors; they condemn 'all the Sacraments of the Church. Concerning the Sa-'crament of Baptiſm, they ſay, That the Catechiſm ſig-'nifies nothing, that the Abſolution pronounced over In-'fants avails them nothing: that the God-fathers and 'God-mothers do not underſtand, what they anſwer the 'Prieſt. That the Oblation which is called *Al wegen*, is 'nothing but a meer invention. They reject all Exor-'ciſms and Bleſſings. They wonder why none but the 'Biſhops alone ſhould have power to confirm. Con-'cerning the Sacrament of the Euchariſt they ſay, That 'a Prieſt, guilty of mortal ſin, cannot celebrate that Sa-'crament; but that a good Lay-man, yea a Woman, if 'ſhe knows the Sacramental words, may. That Tranſub-'ſtantiation is not performed by the hands of him who 'celebrates unworthily, but in the Mouth of the worthy 'Receiver, and that it may be celebrated on our common 'Tables. Malach. *In every place ſhall a pure offering be offered to 'my name.* They condemn the Cuſtom of Believers com-'municating no more than once a Year, whereas they 'communicate daily. That Tranſubſtantiation is performed 'by words utter'd in the vulgar Tongue. That the Maſs 'ſignifies nothing: that the Apoſtles knew nothing of it,

'and

'and that it is only done for gain. They reject the 'Canon of the Maſs, and only make uſe of the words of 'Chriſt in their vulgar Tongue. They declare the ſing- 'ing in the Church, to be no better than helliſh howling. 'They deſpiſe Canonical hours. That the offering made 'by the Prieſt in the Maſs, is of no value. They re- 'ject the kiſs of Peace, that of the Altar, of the Prieſts 'Hands, and Popes Feet. They ſay, concerning the Sa- 'crament of Penance, That none can be abſolved by a 'wicked Prieſt. That a good Lay-man hath the power 'of abſolving; and that they by laying on of their hands 'can forgive ſins, and conferr the Holy Ghoſt. That it 'is much better to confeſs to a good Laick, than to a 'wicked Prieſt. That no heavy penances ought to be 'impoſed, according to the Example of Chriſt, who ſaid 'to the Woman taken in Adultery, *Go thy way, and ſin* 'no more. All publick Penances and Chains they diſap- 'prove of, eſpecially in Women. That a general Con- 'feſſion ought not to be made every year. They con- 'demn the Sacrament of Marriage, declaring, That thoſe 'who enter into the ſtate of Marriage without hope of Chil- 'dren, are guilty of mortal ſin. *Compaternity*, they ſay, 'ſignifies nothing, as to the hindring of Marriage, nei- 'ther have they any regard to the degrees of Carnal or 'Spiritual Affinity, which the Church obſerves, nor to 'the impediments of order and publick decency, or to 'the prohibition of the Church in that matter. That a 'Woman after Child birth doth not ſtand in need of any 'Bleſſing or Churching. That it was an error of the 'Church, to forbid the Clergy to Marry; whereas the ſame 'is allowed of by the Eaſtern Church: That it is no ſin 'in thoſe who are continent, to kiſs or embrace. They 'diſallow of the Sacrament of Extream Unction, becauſe 'the ſame is only given to the Rich, and becauſe 'many Prieſts are neceſſary to adminiſter it. They hold 'the Sacrament of Orders to be of no uſe, becauſe eve- 'ry good Lay-man is a Prieſt; the Apoſtles themſelves 'being all Lay-men. That the preaching of a wicked 'Prieſt, cannot profit any Body. That what is uttered

'in

'in the Latin Tongue, can be of no uſe to Lay-men. 'They mock at the tonſure of Prieſts. They reproach 'the Church that ſhe raiſeth Baſtards, Boys and notori- 'ous ſinners to high Eccleſiaſtical Dignities That every 'Lay man, yea and Woman too may preach. *Corinth. For 'you may all Propheſie one by one, that all may be edified.* 'Whatſoever is preached without Scripture proof, they ac- 'count no better than Fables. That the Holy Scripture 'is of the ſame efficacy in the vulgar Tongue as in 'Latin, and accordingly they communicate, and admini- 'ſter the Sacraments in the Vulgar Tongue. They can 'ſay a great part of the Old and New Teſtament by 'heart. They deſpiſe the Decretals, and the Sayings, 'and Expoſitions of Holy Men, and only cleave to the 'Text of Scripture. They contemn Excommunication, 'neither do they value Abſolution, which they expect 'from God alone. They reject the Indulgences of the 'Church, deride Diſpenſations, neither do they believe 'any irregularity. They admit none for Saints ſave only 'the Apoſtles; they pray to no Saint. They contemn the 'Canonization, Tranſlation, and the Vigils of the 'Saints. They laugh at thoſe Lay-men, who chooſe them- 'ſelves Saints at the Altar. They never read the Litany. 'They give no credit to the Legends of the Saints, and 'make a mock of the Saints Miracles. They deſpiſe 'the Reliques of the Saints. They abhor the Wood of 'the Holy Croſs, becauſe of Chriſt's ſuffering on it, nei- 'ther do they ſign themſelves with it. That the Doctrine 'of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, is ſufficient to Salvation, 'without any Church Statutes and Ordinances. That the 'Traditions of the Church, are no better than the Tra- 'ditions of the Phariſees; and that greater ſtreſs is laid 'on the Obſervation of humane Tradition, than on the 'keeping of the Law of God. *Matth. Why do ye tranſgreſs the Law of God by your Traditions?* 'They refute the myſtical 'ſenſe of Scripture, eſpecially in Sayings and Actions 'traditionally delivered and publiſhed by the Church; as 'that the Cock upon Steeples ſignifies the Paſtor, and ſuch- 'like.

'Their

'Their Errors of a third rank are theſe; They contemn all 'approved Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtoms, which they do not read 'of in the Goſpel, as the Obſervation of Candlemas, Palm-'Sunday, the Reconciliation of Penitents, the Adoration of 'the Croſs on Good-Fryday. They deſpiſe the Feaſt of '*Eaſter*, and all other Feſtivals of Chriſt and the Saints, be-'cauſe of their being multiplied to that vaſt number, and 'ſay, that one day is as good as another, and work upon Holy-'days, where they can do it, without being taken notice of. 'They diſregard the Church-Faſts, alledging that of *Iſai.* 58. *Is this the Faſt that I have choſen?* 'They deride and 'mock at all Dedications, Conſecrations and Benedicti-'ons of Candles, Aſhes, Palm-branches, Oil, Fire, Wax-'candles, *Agnus Dei*, Women after Child-bearing, Strangers, 'Holy places and Perſons, Veſtments, Salt and Water. 'They look upon the Church, built of Stone, to be no 'better than a common Barn, and call it commonly *Stein-'haus*, neither do they believe that God dwells there, *Acts* 17. *God doth not dwell in temples made with hands:* 'And that 'Prayer made in them, is of no greater efficacy, than thoſe 'which we offer up in our Cloſets, *Matth.* 6. *But thou when 'thou prayeſt enter into thy cloſet.* 'They have no value for 'the Dedication of Churches, and call the Ornaments of 'the Altar, *The ſin of the Church*, and that it were much 'better to clothe the Poor, than to deck Walls. They ſay 'concerning the Altar, That it is waſtefulneſs to let ſo 'much cloath rotting upon Stones, and that Chriſt never 'gave to his Diſciples Veſts, nor Rockets, nor Miters. 'They celebrate the Euchariſt in their Houſhold Cups, and 'ſay, that the *Corporal* or Cloth on which the Hoſt is 'laid, is no holier than the Cloth of their Breeches. Con-'cerning Lights uſed in the Church, they ſay, that God, 'who is the true Light, doth not ſtand in need of Light, 'and that it can have no further uſe in the Church, than 'to hinder the Prieſts from ſtumbling in the dark. They 'reject all Cenſings. Holy-Water they eſteem no better 'than common Water. The Images and Pictures in the 'Church they declare to be Idolatry. They mock at the 'ſinging in Churches, that the efficacy is only in words and

'not in the Muſick. They deride the cries of the Lay-men, 'and reject all Feſtival Proceſſions, as thoſe at Eaſter, 'as well as mournful Proceſſions in Rogation week and at 'Funerals. They ſay, that the ſinging by day and by night, 'is a thing lately inſtituted by *Gregory*, which in former times 'was not uſed in the Church. They find fault, that the 'Prieſt ſuffers many Maſſes to be ſung the ſame day for 'ſeveral Perſons. They laugh at the Cuſtom of bringing 'ſick perſons on a Bench before the Altar to make their 'ſupplications there for Health. They rejoice whenever 'there is a publick Interdict, becauſe then they corrupt ma-'ny, ſaying, That they are forced to go to Church, for out-'ward gains ſake; for they themſelves alſo go to Church, 'and hypocritically offer, confeſs and communicate. They 'diſſwade People from going on Pilgrimage to *Rome*, and o-'ther places beyond Sea; though they themſelves pretend 'to go on Pilgrimage, whereas it is only *with deſign 'to viſit their Biſhops*, who live in *Lombardy*. They expreſs 'no value for the Lord's Sepulchre, as well as thoſe of the 'Saints; and condemn the burying in Churches, *Matth.* 23. '*Woe unto you Scribes and Phariſees, becauſe ye build the Tombs*, '&c. and would chooſe rather to be buried in the Field than 'in the Church yard, were they not afraid of the Church. 'That the Offices for the deceaſed, Maſſes for the dead, 'Offerings, Funeral Pomps, Laſt Wills, Legacies, viſiting 'of Graves, the reading of Vigils, anniverſary Maſſes and 'other like Suffrages, are of no advantage to the Souls of 'the deceaſed. They condemn the watching with the dead 'by night; becauſe of the follies and wickedneſs which 'are acted on theſe occaſions. They diſallow of the Con-'fraternities of Clergy-men and Lay men, which is called 'Zech; and declare that all theſe are only invented for 'lucres ſake.

'They hold all theſe Errors, becauſe they deny Purgatory, 'ſaying, that there are no more than two ways, the one of 'the Elect to Heaven; the other of the damned to Hell. *Eccleſ.* 11. *Which way ſoever the tree falleth, there it muſt be.* 'That a good Man ſtands in no need of any Interceſſions, 'and that they cannot profit thoſe that are wicked. That

'all

'all ſins are mortal, and none at all venial. That once praying of the Lord's Prayer, is of more efficacy, than the 'ringing of ten Bells, yea than the Maſs it ſelf. That all 'ſwearing is a mortal ſin, *Matth. But I ſay unto you, Swear not at all, but let your communication be yea, yea, and nay, nay.* 'They think it is an Oath to ſay *Verily* or *Certainly*, 'thereby to excuſe himſelf from ſin, that he may not divulge ſecrets: yea they account him worſe than a Murtherer, that compels another to ſwear; as likewiſe he 'that conferrs Confirmation, becauſe he exacts an Oath 'from the Party that is confirmed, and a Judge of Witneſſes in Law, as likewiſe doth the Inquiſitor, and the 'Prieſt that force Men to abjure their ſins, by which 'means many become perjur'd. They reprove thoſe who 'aſſert, that he who breaks his Promiſe or Oath made to 'the Prieſt, is guilty of ſeven Perjuries. That all Judges 'and Princes are damned, and they declare, that Malefactors 'ought not to be condemned, *Rom.* 12. *Vengeance is mine, I will repay it, ſaith the Lord.* Matth. 13. *Suffer them both to grow together, till the time of Harveſt.* 'They ſay that all 'Eccleſiaſtical Courts, held by Clergy men are not maintained for the correction of evil doers, but for the profit 'which they bring along with them.

Æneas Sylvius gives us the following account of the *Waldenſes* of *Bohemia*, in his Hiſtory of that Kingdom. *Hiſt. Bohem.* p. 141. 'That 'the Pope of *Rome* is equal with other Biſhops. That there 'is no difference amongſt Prieſts. That Prieſthood is not 'a Dignity, but that Grace and Vertue only give the Preference. That the Souls of the deceaſed are either immediately plunged into Hell, or advanced to eternal joys. 'That there is no Purgatory Fire. That it is a vain thing 'to pray for the Dead, and a meer invention of Prieſtly Covetouſneſs. That the Images of God and the Saints ought 'to be deſtroyed. That the Bleſſing of Water and Palm-branches is ridiculous. That the Religion of the *Mendicants* was invented by evil Spirits. That Prieſts ought 'to be poor, and only content themſelves with Alms. 'That every one has liberty to preach. No capital ſin 'ought to be tolerated upon pretence of avoiding a greater

'evil. That he who is guilty of mortal ſin, ought not 'to enjoy any Secular or Eccleſiaſtical Dignity, or to 'be obeyed in any thing. That the Confirmation which 'is celebrated with anointing, and Extreme Unction, is 'none of the Sacraments of the Church. That Auri-'cular Confeſſion is a piece of foppery: that every one 'in his Cloſet ought to confeſs his ſins to God. That 'Baptiſm ought to be celebrated, without the Addition 'of Holy Oil. That the uſe of Church-yards is vain, 'and nothing but a Covetous invention. That it's all 'one what ground dead Bodies be buried in. That the 'Temple of the great God, is the whole World, and 'that it is a limiting of the Divine Majeſty, to build 'Churches, Monaſteries and Oratories, as if the Divine 'Goodneſs could more favourably be found in them, 'than elſewhere. That the Prieſtly Veſtments, Altar, 'Ornaments, Palls, Corporals, Chalices, Patins and other 'Veſſels are of no efficacy. That a Prieſt may in any 'place conſecrate the Body of Chriſt, and give it to thoſe 'who deſire it, by reciting only the Sacramental words. 'That it is in vain to implore the Suffrages of the Saints reign-'ing with Chriſt in Heaven, becauſe they cannot help us. 'That it is to no purpoſe to ſpend ones time in ſinging 'and ſaying the Canonical hours. That we are to ceaſe 'from working on no day except the Lord's day. That 'the Holy-days of Saints are to be rejected; and that there 'is no merit in obſerving the Faſts inſtituted by the 'Church.

I do believe that it is not too hard for any judicious Reader to conſider, 1. The difference between thoſe accounts given by theſe Authors. 'Tis too ſenſible not to be ſuddenly perceived. 2. That the Dominican Fryer has ſtrangely increaſed the number of Controverſies, picking out all occaſions to exaſperate his Reader againſt them. 3. That he has repreſented thoſe Controverſies in a very ſcurrilous manner, to make them the more ridiculous: from which way we do confeſs, that *Æneas Sylvius* was very far.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Some inſtances of the Arguments which the Waldenſes *of* Bohemia *waged in their Diſputes with the Church of* Rome.

THE ſame Inquiſitor, whoſe extract I have but now given, gives us an account of the manner how the *Bohemians*, who were a Colony of the *Waldenſes*, managed their Controverſies with the Church of *Rome*. I did not conceive it fitting to change any thing in his Style, nor to make my Reflections on the Objections which he puts into their Mouths; it being enough that I have given my Reader notice, that it is an Inquiſitor that makes them ſpeak ſo.

'The Firſt Error, ſaith he, of the Poor of *Lions*, who 'are alſo called *Leoniſts*, is, That the Church of *Rome* is 'not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, but an Aſſembly of 'wicked Men, and the Whore that ſits upon the Beaſt in 'the *Revelation*. And that the Church of *Rome* ceaſed to be 'the True Church under Pope *Sylveſter*, at which time 'it was poiſoned by temporal Poſſeſſions and Advantages. 'And that they are the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe they 'obſerve the Doctrine of the Goſpel and Apoſtles in their 'words and actions.

'To proceed to other of their Errors: They contemn 'all the Statutes of the Church, and prove them to be 'Null and Void, from Scripture and Reaſon. Levit. *And Nadab and Abihu took their Cenſers, and offered ſtrange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not.* 'Now he offers 'ſtrange fire, who obſerves or teacheth other Traditions 'contrary to the command of God, and ſuch are all the 'Traditions of the Church. Therefore, *&c.* they ſay, That 'the Doctrine of the Goſpel and the Apoſtles is ſufficient to 'Salvation, and that the Canons are meer Traditions.

Matth.

Matth. *Why do you transgress the command of God to establish your traditions?*

'They say, That the occasion of this their Error, is, be-'cause the Statutes of the Church are burthensome and 'many, whereas those of Christ are few and easie. Acts. *Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the Disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear.* 'And that the multiplying of Precepts, 'necessarily causeth an implication of Transgressions. '*Item*, That those Statutes of the Church, which belong to 'Church-Lands and Possessions, are directly contrary to the 'commands of God. Deut. *The Priests shall have no inheritance with the People.* '*Item*, The Laws of Christ are 'universal, and reach all those of the Church, particular-'ly that of Tithes, *Deut.* That the Eastern Church doth 'not regard the Statutes of the Church of *Rome*. *Item*, That 'they who make them, do not observe them, *Matth. They bind heavy burdens on others.* '*Item*, That the Statutes of 'the Church are often changed; as may be seen in the 'case of degrees of Consanguinity: whereas those of 'Christ do never change, *Luke. But my words shall not pass away.* 'That the Church ordains those things, she thinks to 'be for her own advantage, as her immunity, *&c.* That 'the Laws of Christ are finite, whereas those of the Church 'are infinite.

'They declare the Pope to be Head and Ring-leader of 'all Errors. The Prelates they call Blind, and the Religi-'ous, Pharisees. They are of Opinion, That all Clergy-'men, that do not work for their living, are guilty of sin: 'and say they are full of Pride, Covetousness, Envy. Of 'Pride, *because they love the uppermost Seats, and to be called* 'of men, *Rabbi.* Of Covetousness, because they do all for 'filthy lucre sake *Jerem. From the least to the greatest of them,* 'they run after covetousness. Of Envy, because they alone 'will be Masters, *Luke. Woe unto you Scribes, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge.* 'Wherefore they say, That 'every Man, yea and Woman too may preach, *Numb. Moses said, Would to God that all the Lords people were Prophets*; and the Apostle St. *Paul, For ye may all prophesie one by one,*

that

that all may be edified. Luk. *If theſe ſhould hold their peace, the ſtones would cry out.* Revel. *Let him that hears, ſay, Come.* 'And becauſe the Apoſtles themſelves were Lay-men, there-'fore becauſe if a Lay man may preach for gain, much more 'may he preach for God.

'They declare alſo, That God alone is to be obeyed, 'and not the Prelates or Pope. They ſay, the Church is 'guilty of Idolatry, by ſuffering ſuch Doctrines as theſe to 'be preached, That the Pope is a God on Earth, greater 'than Men, equal with Angels, and that he cannot ſin. They 'reproach us for calling the Pope Father, and the Monks for 'calling their Abbots ſo. Matth. *Call ye no man Father 'upon earth, for One is your Father, &c.* They deny alſo 'that they ought to be obeyed in whatſoever they command. 'They reject kneeling to Prieſts, alledging, that of the An-'gel forbidding *John* to kneel to him.

'They contemn the Sacraments of the Church, becauſe 'of the undue and irreverent manner wherein they are 'celebrated by many Prieſts; and becauſe they ſet them 'to ſale, as alſo becauſe of the wicked and ſcandalous 'Lives of many Miniſters. They declare the Pope, and all 'Biſhops to be Murtherers, by reaſon of the Wars, which 'they maintain and ſtir up againſt Chriſtians, Pagans, and 'Hereticks: And they condemn thoſe that preach up the '*Holy War*, becauſe they ſay the Turks and Pagans ought 'not to be forc'd to embrace the Faith by the Sword, 'but to be allur'd by Preaching.

'Some of them are in an Error concerning Baptiſm, 'holding, That Infants cannot be ſaved by it; *Matth. 'Whoſoever ſhall believe, and be baptized, ſhall be ſaved:* But 'an Infant does not believe, therefore is not ſaved. Some 'of them do baptize, others uſe impoſition of Hands 'inſtead of Baptiſm. And the occaſion of this their Practice 'is, Becauſe they ſay the Godfathers do not underſtand the 'Queſtions put to them by the Prieſt.

'They reject the Chriſm; they ſlight Confirmation; yet 'ſome few amongſt them do receive it, though they be 'Fifty years of age.

'They

'They find fault, That the Biſhops only appropriate Confir-
'mation to themſelves; whereas the Sacrament of the Lord's
'Body, which is much more worthy, is permitted to Prieſts.

'They hold, That a Prieſt in mortal Sin cannot give
'the Euchariſt, becauſe *Uzzah* was ſtruck dead for touch-
'ing the Ark, and *John* durſt not touch the Lord's Head.
'They maintain, That a pious Layman, yea, a Woman,
'ſo ſhe do but know the words, may give the Euchariſt;
'and that Tranſubſtantiation is not made in the hands of
'him that celebrates, but in the mouth of the worthy Re-
'ceiver; *Pſal. The Lord hath heard the deſire of the Poor,*
'That which gave occaſion to this their Error, is, be-
'cauſe the *Levites* miniſtred the Body of the Lord; as
'*Laurentius* and *Tharſinus*, who ſuffered at *Rome*. Some
'alſo receive the Euchariſt in any form; ſome of wild
'Grapes, ſome of Bread dipt in Wine; ſome take Sor-
'rel in a Diſh; ſome after they have cleanſed their mouths,
'communicate again. Others receive it with Vinegar:
'Some keep the Euchariſt in their Chambers, and in their
'Gardens, as in *Bavaria*. The Subdeacons alſo adminiſter
'the Lord's Body to the Sick. A Deacon that hath been
'gaming or drinking all night, has been known to cele-
'brate the Euchariſt the next morning in his Shirt. Wit-
'neſs *Goth*, one of the Arch-hereticks, that the Euchariſt
'has been ſeen to crawl with Vermin, according to *Zu-
'vetch*; witneſs the Monks there. That they often tram-
'ple under their feet the Body and Blood of the Lord.
'That it is alſo received and handled amongſt them by
'thoſe who are unworthy, and publick Sinners, and deni-
'ed to the worthy, as to Nuns and Widows, except ſome-
'times in the Lord's Supper. Alſo in the Country it is
'ſeldome given by Scholars without a price put upon it;
'the reaſon is, Becauſe the Churches are let to the Country
'Curates at a dear rate, and the Curates are not able to
'give it to the Scholars without price.

'They hold the Maſs to be worth nothing, alledging,
'That neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles ever ſung Maſs.
'That Chriſt was only offered up once for all; whereas the
'Prieſt offers him up twice in one day. That it is only for

'Gain

'Gain that ſo many Maſſes are ſung. *Mat. Woe unto you 'that devour Widows houſes, under a pretence of long prayers.* 'Item, Becauſe they do not ſing twice Mattins or Vigils. 'They hold them alſo guilty of Sin who buy Maſſes. They 'ſay, that the firſt Maſs of the new *minor* Prieſt, is of no more 'efficacy than the hundredth: the occaſion of this their 'Error, is, Becauſe ſome preach, that a ſinful Prieſt is as 'clean from all Sin as an Angel, by putting on his *Caſula.* 'Some feign to celebrate the Euchariſt without the Ca- 'non. They call the Church-Muſick, Infernal Melody; 'and that all is done for Gain; and that it is loſs to men 'to be hindred from their Work. They contemn Cano- 'nical hours, and ſay, that one *Pater Noſter* is better than 'the noiſe of ten Bells. They hold all Oblations to be 'of no uſe to the Offerer, but only to thoſe who receive 'them; *Luk. I will have mercy, and not ſacrifice.* That it is 'better to give to the Poor, than to offer to the Prieſt. If 'that Place be objected to them, *When thou offereſt thy Gift 'at the Altar, &c.* they anſwer, that the word *Gift* there 'is to be underſtood of an occaſion, or a good work. The 'occaſion that ſeems to have led them into this Error, 'is, Becauſe they ſee that the Offerings are ill ſpent by 'ſome: And they detract from the Maſs, becauſe of the 'ſuperfluous ſinging and tediouſneſs of it, and becauſe 'ſometimes the Prieſt ſcolds whilſt he is ſaying Maſs, and 'being put into a paſſion, breaks off the Maſs abruptly. 'They ſay, that the cuſtom of buying Maſſes is a kind 'of Simony. Some call good Cuſtoms, lucriferous In- 'ventions, and theſe they compel men to obſerve, as 'that which they vulgarly call *Allwegen.*

'Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, they hold, that 'a Prieſt bound in mortal Sin cannot abſolve any, and 'that a pious Layman can do it much better; for who 'can expect to be made clean by him who is filthy him- 'ſelf? Mal. *I will curſe your bleſſings.* Luk. *Phyſician cure 'thy ſelf.* Mat. *Caſt out firſt the beam that is,* &c. Iſa. *The 'Bed is too narrow, ſo that one of the two muſt needs tumble 'down, and the cloak too ſhort to cover both.* By the Bed they 'underſtand the Soul; by both the Perſons they under-

'ſtand God and the Devil. They hold, that a *pious Lay-*
'*man* has power to abſolve. That which a man has not,
'how can he give? That therefore it is much better to
'confeſs to a good Layman, than to a wicked Prieſt. The
'occaſion of this their Error is, becauſe they ſee that
'ſometimes a *Bohemian* Prieſt takes the Confeſſion of a
'*German*, whereas neither of them underſtands the other;
'and becauſe ſometimes the Confeſſion of ten perſons is
'heard together, and ſometimes Confeſſion is made by an In-
'terpreter, becauſe ſay they, publick Confeſſion is made by
'the Damned themſelves: Alſo becauſe ſome ſay that
'Confeſſion avails nothing without offering a Gift, and
'that therefore they neglect to hear the Confeſſions of the
'Poor, which is a piece of Judaiſm. Alſo becauſe it is
'the property of godly Souls to acknowledge themſelves
'many times in fault, when they are not; and that Prieſts
'do not compel Mothers, who do not ſee their ſick In-
'fants die, to undergo a publick Penance, which is uſed
'to be impoſed for the moſt common Sin, and thus ſtill
'crying, *to morrow, to morrow*, they run headlong into Sin.
'And that they are forc'd many times to bear the bur-
'then of many of theſe Penances, that they may be re-
'ſtored again to the Communion of the Church, whereas
'indeed they never had loſt or forfeited it. *Item*, Be-
'cauſe they ſee that for manifeſt Sins only pecuniary
'Mulcts are impoſed, and ſo no ſatisfaction is given to the
'Church; ſo that the eaſineſs of obtaining Pardon becomes
'an Argument to the Sinner to ſin on; Becauſe for ſecret
'ſins they impoſe only ſuch a number of Maſſes. *Item*,
'Becauſe ſome Confeſſors do indirectly betray their Con-
'feſſions, as by writing it down, that it may be read of others.
'Alſo a Wife ſecretly procuring her own miſcarriage, is ſent
'to the Biſhop, and being ſuſpected, is worthily put to death.

'They condemn the Sacrament of Marriage, ſaying, that
'it is a mortal Sin to marry, without the hope of Children.
'Others of them look upon Matrimony to be no better
'than Fornication. The occaſion of this their Error is de-
'rived partly from Marriage it ſelf, becauſe married per-
'ſons neither obſerve time, nor the bounds of Matrimo-
'ny;

'ny; and partly from the Priests, because they compel 'chaste Wives to seek their fugitive Husbands through 'many Countries, who yet are not bound to cohabit with 'their Husbands, except they please; and by this many of 'them are corrupted. *Item*, Because a Bride that is a Vir-'gin is forbid entrance into the Church for Eleven days, 'whereas she who has committed Fornication, is not so 'much as kept out one day. So in like manner, if she 'be brought to bed of a still born Child: Whereas by 'the Canons she may enter the Church the first day after. '*Item*, Because some preach, that a Woman dying in Child-'bed is damned; because they deny the Blessing to poor 'Women that have nothing to offer at their Churching; 'and that they who are ready to be brought to bed, are 'forced to Sin, and so miscarry.

'They say, that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is 'the highest Pride. The occasion hereof is, because this 'Sacrament is given to none but those who can well pay 'for it, and the multitude of Priests is the cause of that: 'And though it be honourable to bring in more Priests; yet 'Extreme Unction, as well as Baptism and Confirmation, 'are alwaies administred only by one. *Item*, Because some 'preach, that this Sacrament ought not to be administred to 'any, except they be at least worth two Cows; which is 'a great scandal to the poor. And because they say, that 'twelve Lights are necessary at the celebrating of Extreme 'Unction, whereas one Light is accounted sufficient at the 'celebration of the Eucharist, which is the most worthy 'Sacrament of all.

'They say, that the Sacrament of Order is of no use, be-'cause the Apostles were Laymen; and that Christ never 'gave them either Rockets, Miters, Hoods, Rings, or any 'other Ornament. They deride Tonsure, because the Apo-'stles knew nothing of it. The reason which they go upon 'is, Because such who are unworthy both as to their Life 'and Knowledge, and Bastards, are advanced to Orders and 'Dignities, scandalizing the Church of God both by their 'Word and Example.

'They ſay likewiſe, that the Church has greatly erred, 'in forbidding the Clergy to marry, becauſe as well the 'old Law as the Goſpel do allow of it; and by their wink-'ing in the mean time at Fornication. *Item*, By her ad-'vancing of Baſtards to the higheſt Promotions in the 'Church. *Item*, Some ſay, that whatever thoſe who have 'vowed chaſtity, above the Girdle, do by kiſſing, feeling, 'words, preſſing of the Breaſts, embraces, is all done in 'charity.

'They contemn Excommunication, and ſay, that it is 'nothing elſe but curſing. Geneſ. *He who curſeth thee,* 'shall be curſed, &c. Eccleſ. *When a wicked man curſeth* 'the Devil, he curſeth his own Soul: Wherefore if he cur-'ſeth a man, he curſeth himſelf. Curſers and Evil-ſpea-'kers ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God. Some ſay, an 'unjuſt Excommunication doth ſtand good. *Item*, When-'ever there is an interdict, the Hereticks rejoice, becauſe 'then they have an opportunity to corrupt Chriſtians, and 'make them undervalue the worſhip of God. That it is 'an ungodly thing to vex and puniſh the innocent, by deny-'ing them the Sacraments, for the ſins of others. That 'by this means the Praiſe of God and of the Court of 'Heaven, is taken away, and the Souls in Purgatory are de-'priv'd of the Suffrages of the Church, and the Devotion of 'living Believers leſſened, and therefore they ſay, that then 'Tenths ought not to be paid. The occaſion of this their 'Error is, Becauſe Excommunications are multiplied upon 'any ſlight occaſion, as, for the tenth Penny; or if a man 'doth not come to Church, in theſe and ſuch like caſes 'Perſons are excommunicated without any lawful order, and 'afterwards are again admitted to communicate without 'foregoing Abſolution; by which means he who gives 'the Sacrament, as well as the excommunicated perſon, and 'the People, are in danger.

'They hold, that Tythes ought not to be given, be-'cauſe they were never given in the Primitive Church; 'and that if Tithes ought not to be received, neither ought 'they to be paid. If you ſay, that they ought to be given, 'becauſe the Jews gave them, by the ſame reaſon all other

'legal

'legal Conſtitutions are to be obſerved. They alledge al-
'ſo, that there are but few Countries, though govern'd by
'Roman Law, where Tithes are paid. They ſay, it is Sin
'to pay Tithes, and that Laymen who receive Tithes do
'ſin likewiſe, becauſe they are ſo wickedly ſpent. They
'ſay, that the Clergy and Prieſts ought to have no Pro-
'priety or Poſſeſſions: Deut. *Neither Prieſts nor Levites,*
'*nor any that are of the Tribe of* Levi, *ſhall have any inheritance*
'*with the people of* Iſrael, *becauſe the Sacrifices are their portion.*
'Act. *And they called nothing their own, of all that they poſſeſſed,*
'*but they had all things common.* They do not believe In-
'dulgences; Luk. *Who can forgive Sin, ſave God alone?* They
'deſpiſe the Church Abſolutions, and do not mind irregu-
'larity, nor have they any Faith in the Church's Diſpen-
'ſations. That which led them into this Error, was the
'multiplying of Indulgences, and becauſe future Puniſhment
'is bought off by the People, which they do not be-
'lieve.

'They deſpiſe the Feaſts of the Church, ſaying, that
'one day is like another. If it be objected to them, That
'God has commanded the Seventh day to be ſanctified;
'they anſwer, That if for that reaſon the Sabbath day is
'to be kept, that Circumciſion is to be kept for the ſame
'reaſon.

'They took offence at them, becauſe there are no leſs
'than an hundred and twenty Holidays in a year, becauſe
'ſome ſay, that the Feaſt of *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt* are the
'Feaſts of St. *Stephen* and St. *John*. Becauſe Fairs are kept
'on Holidays. Becauſe Holidays are transferr'd to Sun-
'days for Gain. Becauſe *Taylors* and *Carriers* are ſuffered
'to work then. Becauſe there be too many Holidays,
'*Tranſlations*, *Inventions*, and *Octaves*, ſo that there is ſcarce
'a week which has not two or three of them. Becauſe
'they are introduced only for Gain, which is a great ſcan-
'dal to the People. Becauſe Workmen, by being hin-
'dred from their work, do thereby fall to poverty. Be-
'cauſe on thoſe days more ſins are committed than any
'other. Becauſe the Primitive Church had very few Feaſts;
'wherefore alſo they ſecretly work on thoſe days.

'They

'They deſpiſe the Faſts of the Church, for on *Good-Friday* they eat Fleſh. *The Kingdom of God is not Meat, &c.* Iſai. *Is this the Faſt that I have choſen?* Corinth. *Let not him that eats not, judge him that eats.* The ground of their Error was, Becauſe poor men and Labourers are obliged in *Lent* to faſt with Bread and Water: and alſo, Becauſe they can get no work, upon the account of theſe days of Abſtinence.

'The material Edifice of the Church they eſteem to be no better than a Barn, and nickname it commonly the *Stonehouſe*. Act. *God doth not dwell in temples made with hands*. And that Prayers made in them are of no more efficacy than if they were made in any other Houſe. Luk. *But thou, when thou prayeſt, enter into, &c.* John. *Neither in this mountain nor at* Jeruſalem *ſhall ye worſhip, &c.* Act. *Liſting up pure hands in all places.* The occaſion of their miſtake was, Becauſe the Church makes men carnal, it being a place of their acting in Maſquerade, and making a ſhew with their fine Cloathes.

'They contemn the Dedication of Churches; they call the Altar an heap of Stones, and that it is a piece of waſtefulneſs to let Cloth rot upon Stones. The occaſion; the prodigious Expences laid out upon Churches, which might with far greater profit be beſtowed upon the Poor. Mat. *Do you ſee all theſe Buildings? there ſhall not be left a ſtone, &c.* As alſo, becauſe ſome ſet up Taverns in the Church; and becauſe ſome ſay, that as oft as a man goes round the Church, ſo many mortal Sins are forgiven him. Alſo becauſe ſome ſay and preach, that to frequent a ſtrange Church is a committing of Adultery. That it is better to preach in a Stable than in the Church. The Ornaments of the Church they ſay are ſinful, and that it is better to cloath the Poor, than to hang Walls. The *Corporal*, they ſay, is no better than the Cloth of their Breeches. Concerning Lights in the Church, they ſay, that God, who is the true Light, doth not ſtand in need of light; and that the Cup uſed in the Sacrament, doth not differ from a common Houſhold cup, becauſe formerly they made uſe of Glaſs Chalices.

'They

'They reject Cenſings; they value Holy Water no more 'than common Water: Images and Pictures, they ſay, 'are Idolatry: *Exod.* 20. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any 'graven Image, &c.* Theſe Errors aroſe from the Scandal 'which they took at the horrid wooden Images and Pi-'ctures which they daily ſaw, and which in their Opi-'nion rather ſtrike a man with Horror than Devotion. 'They deride Church-Muſick, ſaying, that Virtue and 'Efficacy is in words and not in the melody. This ſprung 'originally from the tedious and ſuperfluous Singing in 'Churches. They mock at the cries and ſhouts of the 'People. They contemn Proceſſions, becauſe of the Follies 'that are acted at them.

'They believe no Saints, beſides the Apoſtles and ſuch as 'are mentioned in the Goſpels or Acts of the Apoſtles; 'They call upon no Saint, no not the Bleſſed Virgin, but 'God alone. This proceeded from the many falſe Saints, 'as *Vivianus* and others, whoſe Names, Lives, and Merits, 'are unknown. They ſhew no reſpect to Spring, as in '*Drozo*; where the Prieſt baptizeth the Crucifix in the 'Spring and the People offers to the Spring. *Item*, Holy 'Trees, as thoſe of St. *Chriſtopher*, and the Air in the Fields. '*Item*, They deride the Names of the Saints, as *Erhardo*, 'honouring them with Oblations. *Item*, Becauſe no De-'votion is expreſt to the Saints of the Old Teſtament. 'Becauſe the Honour which ought to be given to God, is 'more exhibited to Creatures than to God alone: Thus 'ſome faſt every *Wedneſday*, in honour of St. *Nicholas*, who 'do not faſt on *Friday*, in honour of God; and ſo like-'wiſe when St. *Nicholas* is named, all ſigh; whereas when 'Jeſus Chriſt is named, all hold their peace. They give 'no credit to the Legends and Sufferings of the Saints. 'This aroſe from the contradiction about *Conſtantine*'s 'Baptiſm, and many things altogether incredible, as in the 'Legend of St. *Margaret* and *Juliana*, and the *ſeven Sleepers*. 'They do not believe the Miracles of the Saints. This 'Incredulity was occaſioned by the many falſe Miracles, 'as Oil, Blood, Tears of Images, and Heavenly Light. And 'by reaſon of thoſe Hypocrites, who are commonly called

'*Sterzet*,

'*Sterzet*, who pretending themſelves to be afflicted with di-
'vers ſickneſſes, declare they are ſuddenly recovered.

'They give no credit to the Reliques of Saints. This was
'occaſioned by the falſe Reliques which ſome carry about, as
'the Milk of the Bleſſed Virgin, who with a ſmall quan-
'tity of Milk ſuckled our Saviour, and a Salamander for
'the Garment of the Bleſſed Virgin, and the Sweat of Chriſt,
'and the Membrane in which our Saviour was wrapt, and the
'Reliques of Angels. Likewiſe becauſe one of theſe Relique-
'mongers boaſted, that he could make what Saints he pleaſed,
'and being asked how? anſwered, that he often took the
'Bone of an Ox, and ſawed it into ſmall pieces, which he
'wrapt up in purple, writing about them the names of
'what Saints he pleaſed. And becauſe they baptize the Milk
'of the Bleſſed Virgin, and then give the Water to drink.
'*Item*, Becauſe they make merchandize of them, and are
'often eaten by Mice, which thing was related to the People
'by this Prieſt, and the People much ſcandalized thereat.
'Becauſe ſeveral Churches quarrel and diſpute about the Bo-
'dies of Saints, each maintaining that they have them,
'as about the Body of St. *Mark*, St. *Vitus*, and the reſt.

'They abhor the Holy Croſs, becauſe of Chriſt's Suf-
'fering thereon. Their averſion ſeems to have been taken
'from the Sermons of thoſe who maintained, that the
'Croſs being taken away from Chriſt, returned of it
'ſelf. They ſay, that the Wood of the Croſs is no more
'than other Wood. They do not arm themſelves with the
'ſign of the Croſs. They ſet no value upon the Sepul-
'chre of our Lord, nor of the Saints. Matth. *Woe to you Pha-
riſees, for ye build the ſepulchres of the Prophets.* 'They deſpiſe
'Church-burial, for they would rather chooſe to be bu-
'ried in a Field, than in a Church yard, but that they
'ſtand in fear of the Church. Their Reaſon for this Opinion
'is, Becauſe thoſe who die without Contrition are buried
'there, and they who kill themſelves; and on the con-
'trary, many times Church-burial is denied to thoſe who
'die truly contrite. Becauſe mony is demanded for eve-
'ry one, even for Infants, who do not ſtand in need of
'any Suffrages, and for Lepers. Becauſe ſome Saints were
'formerly

'formerly buried in Gardens as our Saviour; ſome in 'their own Houſes, ſome in the Water, as St. *Clemens*. 'They reject the watching with the Dead, becauſe of the 'follies committed on thoſe occaſions. Becauſe the Laws 'of the Church from the beginning of the World, and 'the Eccleſiaſtical Canons do allow every Man to chooſe 'his burying-place where he pleaſeth: Becauſe many quar-'rels and conteſts ariſe about dead Bodies, and frequent 'Scandals both to Believers and Unbelievers. They con-'demn all Pilgrimages, becauſe of thoſe many abuſes, 'which they have given occaſion to; as, that many Wo-'men who go on Pilgrimages have been debauched by 'the way; and becauſe of the falſe and counterfeit Pil-'grims, which they call *Stezzar*. *Item*, Becauſe they ſay, 'that Chriſt and his Apoſtles built his Church on the 'Waters, and that to Pilgrims all ſins are forgiven, as much 'as in Baptiſm.

'They deny Purgatory, and maintain that there are only 'two ways, the one of the Elect to Heaven; the other 'of the Damned to Hell. *Which way ſoever the tree falls, there it lyes.* 'They ſay, that neither Maſſes nor Anni-'verſaries, nor Offerings, nor other Suffrages are of any 'profit to the Souls of the deceaſed, but that they are 'only done for the gain that comes by them to the 'Prieſts. To that place in the *Corinth. If any build hay or ſtubble, he ſhall be ſaved, but ſo as by fire*; 'they anſwer, 'that by *fire* there, is to be underſtood the fire of Tri-'bulation and Affliction. St. *Auſt. He who prays for his Mother, does his Mother an injury*; 'therefore he who 'cauſeth Maſſes to be ſaid for his Children, or prays 'for them, does rather injure, than benefit them. If a 'Man be good, he ſtands in no need of any Suffrages; 'if wicked, they can do him no good, *John. I pray for them, not for the world*; 'that is, for worldly Men. Now 'if we be not to pray for them whilſt they are alive, 'much leſs when they are dead. They ſay, that the 'Prayers of a good Lay-man, are of more profit than 'thoſe of a wicked Prieſt; and that one Lord's Prayer, 'is of greater efficacy, than many Maſſes. John. *We know*

that God does not hear ſinners. Iſaiah. *When you multiply your prayers, I will not hear.* Greg. *Cum is quibus diſplicet ad intercedendum mittitur, reati animus ad deteriora provocatur.*

'They ſay, that Latin Prayers can be of no advantage to 'Lay-men. They hold three Errors about Purgatory: the 'Firſt is, That no ſin is Venial, but all are Mortal; the 'Second is, That when the ſin is forgiven, the Puniſhment 'is alſo remitted; whence Men take an occaſion of ſinning 'more freely, and making void the Sacrament of Pe-'nance. Matth. *Repent.* Luke *Bring forth fruits meet for Repentance.* 'The Third Error is, That Interceſſions are un-'profitable.

'They condemn Judges and Princes, ſaying, that Ma-'lefactors ought not to be condemned. Matth. *Judge not, leſt ye be judged,* &c. Geneſ. *He that ſheds mans blood, by man his blood ſhall be ſhed* Exod. *Thou ſhalt not kill.* Matth. *Put up thy ſword in the ſheath, for he who ſmites with the ſword,* &c. Matth. In the Parable of the Tares, *Suffer both of them to grow together till the Harveſt.* 'They ſeem to 'have been led into theſe miſtakes, becauſe Judges and 'Princes are generally unjuſt and Tyrants: and becauſe 'Juſtice is ſet at a price, in Eccleſiaſtical, as well as other 'Courts of Judicature. Iſai. *Woe unto you that juſtifie the wicked for a reward, and turn away the righteouſneſs of the righteous; they do not judge the fatherleſs, and the cauſe of the widow will they not hear.*

'They ſay, that to ſwear is a mortal ſin. Matth. *But I ſay unto you; Swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is Gods throne,* &c. *but let your diſcourſe be yea, yea; and nay, nay.* 'The frequent and continual ſwearing, upon the 'ſlighteſt cauſes, has given occaſion to this Error; as alſo 'becauſe Hereticks by this means fall into Perjury. They 'who never ſwear, are like the Devil, of whom we do not 'read that he ever ſwore.

Theſe are the Errors which he attributes to the *Waldenſes* of *Bohemia*, many of them by meer calumny, ſome others by an ill conſtruction of their Doctrine, as our Writers *Perrin* and *Uſſerius* have demonſtrated.

As

As to their conduct he gives this account of them. 'Hereticks are known by their manners and words; for they 'are orderly and modeſt in their manners and behaviour, 'they avoid all pride in their habits, as wearing neither 'very rich Cloaths, nor over mean and ragged ones. 'They keep up no Commerce or Trade to avoid lies, 'ſwearing and deceit, but only live by the labour of their 'own hands, as Handycrafts-men, and Day-labourers; and 'their Teachers are Weaver and Taylors. They do not heap up 'Riches, but are content with neceſſaries. They are alſo very 'chaſte. They are ſparing and very temperate in eating 'and drinking; they do not frequent Taverns or Ale-'houſes, neither do they go to Balls or other Vanities. 'They abſtain from Anger. When they work, they ei-'ther learn or teach; and therefore pray but little. They 'hypocritically go to Church, offer, confeſs, communicate 'and hear Sermons, to catch the Preacher in his words. In 'like manner alſo their Women are very modeſt, avoid-'ing backbiting, fooliſh jeſting, and levity of words, and 'eſpecially abſtaining from lies and ſwearing; not ſo much 'as making uſe of the common Aſſeverations, *in truth*, '*for certain*, or the like; becauſe they look upon theſe to 'be Oaths. They ſeldom anſwer directly to the Queſtion 'demanded of them. So if you ask them, Are you ac-'quainted with the Goſpel or the Epiſtles? they anſwer, *Who ſhould have taught me them?* Or elſe, *Theſe are for them to learn who are of a great and deep underſtanding, or thoſe who are fit for ſuch things, and have leiſure for them.* 'They 'commonly ſay only, *yea, yea; no, no*; and ſay, *This is lawful for them, becauſe Chriſt ſaid to the Jews, Pull down this Temple, though he meant it not concerning* Solomon's *Temple.*

The manners and behaviour of the *Waldenſes* is as follows; 'They kneel down upon the ground, before a 'Bench or ſuch like, and continue thus in all their Pray-'ers in ſilence, as long as one might repeat a *Pater Noſter* 'thirty or forty times, and conclude their Prayers by repeat-'ing the word *Amen* ſeveral times. And this they do every 'day very reverently, amongſt thoſe of their own per-

'ſwaſion, without the company of any ſtrangers, before 'noon, after noon, and at night when they go to Bed; 'and in the mornings when they riſe out of Bed: be- 'ſides ſome other times as well in the day, morning and 'at night. They ſay, teach, nor have any other Prayer 'beſides *Our Father*. They do not look upon the Salutation 'of the Angel to be a Prayer, nor the Apoſtles Creed; 'and ſay, that theſe were introduced by the Church of '*Rome*, not by Chriſt. However they have drawn up a 'ſhort draught of the ſeven Articles concerning the God- 'head, and as many concerning the Humane Nature, the 'Ten Commandments, and the Seven Works of Mercy, 'which they ſay and teach, and boaſt much of them, 'and readily offer themſelves to anſwer any one that de- 'mands of them a reaſon of their Faith. Before they 'ſet themſelves down to Table, they bleſs it, ſaying, *Bleſs the Lord. Lord have mercy upon us, Chriſt have mercy upon us, Lord have mercy upon us. Our Father*, &c. 'After 'which, the eldeſt of the Company ſaith in the vulgar 'Tongue, *God who bleſſed the five Barly Loaves, and two Fiſhes in the Deſart before his Diſciples, bleſs this Table, and that which is upon it, and which ſhall be ſet upon it* (and then make the ſign of the Croſs) *in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Amen.* 'And when they riſe from 'Table after Dinner or Supper, they give thanks in this 'manner; the eldeſt amongſt them in the Vulgar Tongue 'repeating the Doxology ſet down in the *Revelation*; *Bleſſing and Glory and Wiſdom and Thanksgiving, Honour, Power and Might be aſcribed to God alone, for ever and ever. Amen.* 'And then adds, *God render a good reward and a plentiful return to all thoſe who are our Benefactors; and the God who hath given us corporal food, vouchſafe us alſo the life of the Spirit; and God be with us, and we with him always.* And the Company anſwer, *Amen.* 'Alſo when they bleſs the 'Table, and when they return thanks, they fold their hands 'together and lift them up towards Heaven. And after 'Dinner, when they have return'd thanks, and prayed as before- 'ſaid, they preach, teach and exhort according to their 'way and Doctrine.

In

In the Year of our Lord 1391. the Fourth of *September* were underwritten the Errors of the Sect of the *Waldenses*. Then he gives an account of their Miniſter.

'Firſt, *Nicholas* of *Poland*, the Son of a Husbandman. '*Conrad* of *Saxony*, of the Town of *Duhen*, near *Wiſſe-*'*burg*, the Son of a Husbandman. *Walrick* of *Hardech*, a 'Taylor. *Conrad* of *Gamundia*, of the County of *Suabia*, 'the Son of a Husbandman. *Simon* of *Salig*, an *Hungarian*, 'a Taylor. *Heramus* of *Miſtelgen*, a *Bavarian*, by his 'Trade a Carpenter. *John* of *Drena*, a *Bavarian*, like-'wiſe a Carpenter. Theſe aforenamed are called a-'monſt them Apoſtles, Maſters, Angels and Brethren.

Their life and converſation is thus, Firſt, 'They faſt 'three or four days in a week with Bread and Water, 'except they be obliged to work hard. After this they 'appear amongſt thoſe who are of the ſame Faith with 'them; as their Superiors. They pray ſeven times in a 'day. The eldeſt begins the Prayer, and makes it either 'long or ſhort, according as he thinks fitting, and the 'company goes along with him in his Prayer. Their 'Teachers go very meanly dreſt, they walk two 'and two together, an Old Man with a Young Man, 'whereever they go. They are very wary in their words, 'and avoid Lies, Oaths and all filthy things; and inform 'and exhort their Auditory to do the ſame.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

Concerning the Government of the Churches of the Waldenſes, and of the Succeſſion of their Miniſters.

IF we had a well continued Hiſtory of the Churches of the Valleys, it would be eaſie for us to make it appear, 1. That they have alwaies exactly preſerved amongſt them a Church Government, in the ſame manner as it was eſtabliſhed in the midſt of the Eleventh Century, after their Separation from the Church of *Rome*, which happened in the time of *Wido* Archbiſhop of *Milan*, in the year of our Lord 1059. and that they diſtinguiſhed their Clergy into three Orders, Biſhop, Prieſts and Deacons. 2. That their Miniſters exerciſed theſe holy Functions, extraordinarily to the Edification of their People. 3. That it is not true, that they gave leave to Laymen to preach or adminiſter the Sacraments. But we own it to be a difficult thing to ſet down the Succeſſion of their Paſtors, and to ſpecifie them by name, the Perſecutions they continually lay under, having deſtroyed almoſt all their ancient Records: in the mean time there are ſtill ſome Teſtimonies of their Adverſaries remaining, which evidently prove the firſt Article.

Firſt, *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud*, in his Treatiſe againſt the Sect of the *Waldenſes* and *Arians*, *chap.* 6, accuſeth only ſome of the *Waldenſes* of having no Paſtors; which ſhews, that the Body of that Church had a fixt Miniſtry before the end of the XII. Century; and whereas elſewhere he chargeth them with uſurping the Church-Miniſtry, it is either a very falſe Accuſation, or which only reſpected ſome of *Peter Waldo*'s Diſciples, who being diſperſed by the Perſecution, thought themſelves in that

ſtate

ſtate to have Right to Preach, and to oppoſe the Errors of the Church of *Rome*.

Secondly, *Raynerus*, who lived in 1250, doth acknowledge, that they had their Biſhops in *Lombardy*; cap. 5. *Lombardiam intrantes, viſitant Epiſcopos ſuos.* When they come into Lombardy, they viſit their Biſhops. *Matthew Paris*, *ad Ann.* 1243. ſpeaks of a Biſhop of the *Paterines* in *Cremona*, who was depoſed by them for Fornication. *Pilichdorph*, whom the Biſhop of *Meaux* quotes, ſhews, That they did not approve of a Layman's celebrating the Euchariſt, *Chap.* 1. which ſufficiently proves, that they made a ſignal difference between the Clergy and the People; and that it is abſolutely falſe, that they were only a company of Laymen, who took to themſelves the power of preaching and adminiſtring the Sacraments, though nothing be more obvious in the Writings of their Adverſaries than this Charge.

Bib. Pat. Par. P. 752.

Var. p. 223.

If we caſt our Eyes upon the Colonies they have ſent to ſeveral places, we ſhall find the ſame Diſcipline in uſe amongſt them. Thus we ſee that in the Kingdom of *Naples* they had a Superior, who conferr'd Orders in the City of *Aquila*. We find the ſame thing in *Bohemia*, in the Confeſſion of Faith they preſented to *Uladiſlaus*, p. 838. *Ordinandi majoribus aut minoribus ordinibus, promovendi vitâ virtuoſâ in Chriſti fide, &c.* The ſame is obſerved in an ancient abridgment of the Opinions of the *Waldenſes*, recorded by *Wolfius*, *Lect. Memor. ad Ann.* 1160, pag. 380. *They abſolutely deny the Pope's Primacy over all Churches, and more eſpecially his power over all Policies, that is his power of both Swords; neither do they hold, that any other Orders ought to be retain'd in the Church, but thoſe of Prieſts, Deacons, and Biſhops.* *Guido Carmelita* attributes to them the ſame Diſcipline, according to the report of *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, *lib.* 12. *pag.* 337. And we find the ſame in *Claudius Seyſſelius adverſus errores Waldenſium*, fol. 10. *Thoſe whom they judge to be the beſt amongſt them, they appoint to be their Prieſts, to whom upon all occaſions they have recourſe, as to the Vicars and Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.*

Leg. T. 2. p. 23.

We

We find their close adhering to this ancient Constitution from the History of *Commenius*, who was the only Surviver of all the Bishops that escaped from the *Bohemian* Persecution, in the History he has published concerning them, taken out of the *Annals* of that Country, which he had saved from the Fire, and which he carefully preserved at *Amsterdam*: in *pag.* 70. and the pages following he tells us, That the Believers of *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, who had separated themselves from the Communion of the Papists and *Calixtines*, having created three Pastors from amongst themselves, found themselves greatly perplexed about their Ordination; but having understood, that there were *Waldenses* dwelling in the Confines of *Moravia* and *Austria*, to the end they might fully satisfie the Scruples, as well of their own Consciences, as of others, as well for that time as for all time to come, they resolved to send *Michael Zambergius*, one of their Pastors (who formerly had received his Orders from the Bishop of *Rome* himself) with two others, to find out these *Waldenses*, and to give them an account of what passed amongst them; but above all, to ask Counsel of them, concerning what they had to do in the matter they were scrupulous about: That they met with one *Stephen* a *Waldensian* Bishop, who sent for another, and some Ministers, in the presence of whom he made it appear to these Deputies of *Moravia* and *Bohemia*, that his Doctrine, as well as that of all other *Waldenses*, was the same that was in the time of *Constantine*: That the said Bishop explain'd to them their several Articles, and related to them the horrible Persecutions which his fellow-Brethren had endured in *Italy* and in *France*; and that finally the said *Stephen*, with the other forementioned, conferr'd the Vocation and Ordination upon the said three Pastors that were sent to them by the imposition of hands, with Power and Authority to create others as there should be occasion. That from that time those of *Bohemia* and *Moravia* desired to unite themselves into one body with the same *Waldenses*, whence it came to pass, that they themselves were afterwards called *Waldenses*. And, *pag.* 75, he further confirms,

firms, That the Churches of *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, did never deny, but that they had received the authority of laying on of hands, and external Succeſſion from the *Waldenſes*.

The ſaid *Commenius*, who publiſhed the Diſcipline of the Churches of *Bohemia* in 1644, gives us this account of the matter in the Preface to his Book. 'It is evident from 'Hiſtory, godly Reader, that the *Bohemian* Nation, after 'that they above two hundred years ago had been happi-'ly enlightned with the light of the Goſpel, by the Mini-'ſtry of *John Huſs*, and *Jerome* of *Prague*, were by the 'deceit of Satan again enticed to the obedience of the 'Apoſtate See (only reſerving to themſelves the Cup 'and ſome other Superficials) *viz.* in the Council of *Baſil*, '*Ann.* 1433. The City *Tabor* only grieving to ſee the ligh-'ted Candle thus hid under a Buſhel, oppoſed themſelves, 'for many years, defending the Purity of their Doctrine, 'and their Conſtancy in the Faith, with their Swords, 'till at laſt they alſo were partly circumvented by fraud, 'and partly oppreſt by violence. Whereupon all thoſe who 'were yet left of *Huſs*'s Followers, being inflam'd with a 'Divine Zeal, took courage, and ſeparating themſelves 'from the *Calixtines*, or pretended *Huſſites*, in the year 1457. 'they happily ſet up diſtinct Meetings in ſeveral places, 'ſupported only by the Divine Aſſiſtance, as alſo a diſtinct 'Conſiſtory; for a little before thoſe times, ſome part of 'the *Waldenſes* being driven out of *France*, came and 'ſettled themſelves in the Confines of *Auſtria*, with one 'or two of their Biſhops, to whom theſe *Bohemians* ſent 'Deputies, who declared to them their intention, deſiring 'their Counſel and a Chriſtian union with them: the *Wal-'denſes* on the other hand commending their purpoſe ad-'viſed them, that if they deſired to have thoſe Aſſemblies 'that embraced the pure Doctrine of the Goſpel, to be pre-'ſerved from being diſſipated, they ought to take care 'never to want faithful Paſtors.

'Wherefore that they ought not to expect till 'ſome who had their Ordination from *Rome*, ſhould by 'their love to Truth be brought over to them, who might

'ordain Paſtors for them, but rather ordain them them-
'ſelves, as occaſion ſhould offer. And foraſmuch as the ſaid **Waldenſes declared that they had lawful Biſhops amongſt them, and a lawful and uninterrupted Succeſſion from the Apoſtles themſelves**; 'they very ſolemnly created three of our Miniſters Bi-
'ſhops, conferring upon them the power of ordain-
'ing Miniſters, though they did not think fit to take up-
'on them the name of Biſhops, becauſe of the Antichri-
'ſtian abuſe of that name, contenting themſelves with the
'name of *Elders*. As to their union with the *Waldenſes*,
'Before it could be brought about, the good *Waldenſes* were
'again diſſipated, their Biſhop *Stephen* being burnt at
'*Vienna*.

The Biſhop of *Meaux* touches upon this Hiſtory, and ſuppoſeth to have found in it an occaſion of triumph, as believing that it clearly proves, that the *Waldenſes* had no Miniſtry at all, becauſe they were forced to take their Ordination from the Church of *Rome*. He obſerves, that they ſent thoſe whom they deſigned to be Prieſts, to Popiſh Biſhops, to receive their Ordination from them. But this indeed proves juſt the contrary to what he pretends.

1. It appears from hence, that they made a great diſtinction between the Miniſters of the Goſpel and the reſt of the People.

2. That they did not make uſe of the Title of Neceſſity, but in ſuch circumſtances as made out a real Neceſſity.

3. That though they highly declamed againſt the Church of *Rome* and its Miniſtry, yet they nevertheleſs acknowledged, that the Epiſcopal Miniſtry in her was lawful, if ſeparated only from the Corruptions wherewith it was ſtained.

However this action, which ſeems ſo irregular, is no ſtranger than that of the ancient Believers of *Lombardy*, in the time of *Gregory* I, who finding themſelves deprived of Miniſters, by reaſon of the *Arian* Perſecution, which had

ſcattered

ſcattered them, betook themſelves to the *Arian* Prieſts to have their Children baptized, though in other places the validity of the *Arian* Miniſtry was ſo little owned, that they rebaptized the Children, who had been baptized by them.

Neither do I believe that the Biſhop has cauſe to reproach this poor people for their carriage in this behalf, till after he ſhall have perſwaded thoſe of his Communion to aboliſh the Cuſtom they have at *Rome*, to permit the *Greeks*, whom they have ſeduced and bred up in their Seminaries, to receive their Ordination from *Greek* Biſhops, though they account thoſe Biſhops both Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, and get themſelves ordained by them, with deſign to oppoſe with all their might the Greek Churches, from whence they receive their Orders by the laying on of Hands.

Laſtly, This Order has continued until the year 1655. as we may ſee by the example of *Leger*, who was Moderator of the Churches of the Valleys twelve years. It appears from the Hiſtory of *Leger*, that the Moderator, who was during life, had power to call Synods, and to preſide in them, and to celebrate the Function of laying on of Hands, *pag.* 208. And laſtly, we may ſee a proof of what I ſay, in the Churches of *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, who are a Colony of the antient *Waldenſes*. See the account *Comenius* gives us in the year 1660, at which time he was one of their Biſhops, in his Preface to the Book of the Diſciplin of *Fratres Bohemi*; and ſee *pag.* 167, & 168. of *Leger*. pag. 209.

As for the manner of their diſcharging the Function of the Miniſtry, we can ſufficiently juſtifie them, if the teſtimony of their greateſt Enemies is worthy of any conſideration.

Here is the Teſtimony that *Peter Damiani* gives to the Clergy of the Dioceſs of *Turin*, when he writes to *Cunibert* Archbiſhop of *Turin*. He owns, That this Clergy was honeſt enough, and that they were ſufficiently brought up in Learning: That when they met with him, they ſeemed to be an angelick Chorus, a Quire of Angels, and that they ſhinn'd as a conſpicuous Senate of their Church. All that *T.* 3. *Opuſc.* 18.

obliges him to change this good opinion, is only that he was told those Clergymen were married. One can't enough admire the fury with which he aggravates this pretended Crime, neither the care he takes to bear 'em down with the authority of some Councils; yet after all, he is forced to confess, they defended themselves by the authority of the Holy Scripture, and they opposed Councils to Councils whose authority he could not elude, but by declaring that he acknowledged none for Councils, but those which agreed to the Decrees of the Roman Pontifs.

It is an easie matter to reflect upon the vehement accusations they constantly offered, since that time, against the Romish Clergy, with respect to several notorious Crimes, in which they lived publickly, being authorized in them by the publick Custom, or the Canons of this Communion. Indeed they meet with many proofs of it in the Writings of their Adversaries, who never were more weak than when they undertake to repulse those Reproaches offered to them with so much confidence by the *Paterines* or *Waldenses*. But one may be satisfied with the testimony, *Seissellius*, one of the last of their Adversaries, gives to them a little before the Reformation.

'They say, saith *Seissellius*, *fol.* 14. That we of the Roman 'Church open and point out a way to all manner of Dis- 'solutenes and Lust; they received the Order of Priest- 'hood against their wills, and opposing themselves against 'it; whereas we either buy our Priesthood with Money, 'or obtain it by force, or by the favour of some tempo- 'ral Prince, and other sinister ways, and for no other end, 'but to satisfie our Lusts, to enrich our Relations, and 'to acquire worldly Pomp and Glory. Moreover they 'spent their whole lives in manifold watchings, fastings, and 'travels, being neither affrighted with labours or dangers, 'that so they might point out the way of Salvation to 'the Flock committed to them; whereas we spend all our 'time in Idleness, Lusts, and other earthly, yea, wicked and 'ungodly things. They wholly despising Gold and Silver, 'as they had freely received, did in like manner admini- 'ster the Divine Grace to others; whereas we set all holy

'things,

'things, yea, the very Treasures of God's Church to sale. 'And in a word, (that I may not insist on all the parti-'culars which with a most profligate confidence they up-'braid us with) we confound all things both humane and 'divine; insomuch, as that this Church of *Rome* cannot be 'called the Spouse of Christ, but rather that Whore, and 'open prostitute, whom *Isaiah*, *Jeremy*, *Ezekiel*, and *John* in the '*Revelation*, have set forth in her colours.

This without doubt will be sufficient to prove, That as they have preserved the Faith that was committed to them; so have they been as careful to preserve entire amongst them the ancient Discipline of the Church, which was in use in those times, which did most closely adhere to the observation of the Canons. But I will go further yet, and evidence,

1. That they derived this their Ministry from the ancient Church of *Italy*.

2. That they never past for Laymen, upon any better ground than that of some ridiculous Prejudices, the falseness of which the Church of *Rome* doth at present acknowledge.

Whence it will follow, in the 3*d*. place, That nothing can be more false than what is pretended, *viz*. That they had no kind of lawful Ministry amongst them, but that Laymen took upon them the power of preaching, of ordaining Ministers, and administring the Sacraments.

I say therefore, That these Churches had their Ministry from the ancient Churches of the Dioceses of *Italy*. To make out this, we need only examine the Cause of the Separation which the Popes were the occasion of in this Dioceses, and the manner by which it was effected. It was a very ancient Custom for the Clergy to give some Money for their Ordinations; the Popes had for a long time paid a certain sum of Money for their installment, and the Eastern Patriarchs in like manner, a Custom confirm'd by the Novel 123. of *Justinian*, *cap*. 1. This Custom reached all the Bishops and Priests; yea, the very meanest Clerks, who were obliged to pay a certain sum of Money to the Bishop that had ordained them, for inserting their Ordina-

Ordination in the Regiſters of the Church: as may be ſeen in the ſame Novel, *Ch.* 3.

In proceſs of time, when Benefices were conferr'd ſeparate from Ordination, the Biſhops and Laymen that beſtowed them, introduced the Cuſtom of receiving conſiderable Preſents from thoſe whom they named to thoſe Benefices. The Popes, whoſe aim was to get all Benefices out of the hands of the Laymen, laid hold on this favourable occaſion, to execute their deſign. The pretence was very ſpecious, they decry'd this Cuſtome for a real *Simony*, yea, they puſhed the matter yet further, by defining it to be an Hereſie, and maintaining, that ſuch Ordinations were null and void. This is the notion *Petrus Damianus*, Legate of *Nicolaus* II. gave publickly of this matter in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, by re-ordaining, as if they had not been ordained at all, thoſe who confeſſed themſelves to have been ordained and admitted to their Benefices after this manner: Yea, matters were carried to that height, that they who were of the Pope's Party, trampled under their feet the Sacraments that were adminiſtred by theſe *Simoniacks*, to ſhew their zeal for the Pope's Definitions.

This is the firſt Hereſie the Popes formed by their Definitions. The ſecond Hereſie the Popes made, bore the name of *Nicolaitans*: This Hereſie conſiſted in owning that the Miniſters of the Church might be married, and that the Cœlibacy, which the Popes at that time endeavoured to impoſe upon Miniſters, was unjuſt and tyrannical, directly oppoſite to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and to the uſe of Antiquity; notwithſtanding that nothing could be more impure than the Cœlibacy of Eccleſiaſticks was at that time, inſomuch that *Petrus Damianus* himſelf, who was one of the great Promoters of it, by the authority of Pope *Leo* IX. was obliged to write a thundring Treatiſe againſt the Sodomy of Eccleſiaſticks, which then reigned in *Italy*, as it does ſtill to this day. But notwithſtanding all this, the Popes prevailed ſo againſt the Weſtern Churches as to this point, that in the end they in a manner wholly carried it. The Clergy who refuſed to renounce their Wives, were driven from their Benefices,

fices, and becauſe they could not wholly obtain their aim by Temporal Authority, they imployed their pretended Spiritual one, by darting out Excommunication upon Excommunication againſt all married Miniſters, and forbidding the People to own their Miniſtry, and declaring the Sacraments adminiſtred by them to be null and void, and in making them to be lookt upon as meer Laymen, notwithſtanding they had the ordinary Vocation that was then to be had.

We may eaſily imagine how many ſcruples theſe Excommunications raiſed, which all of them return'd upon the Popes themſelves. This we may gather from an Anſwer writ by St. *Bruno* Biſhop of *Aſt*, which we find at the end of the Life of *Leo* IX. writ by St. *Bruno*. The difficulty was this: 'We have already told you (ſaith he) 'that even from the time of *Leo*, the Church was ſo cor-'rupted, that ſcarcely was any one to be found, who was 'not either guilty of *Simony* himſelf, or ordain'd by thoſe 'that were ſo. Wherefore alſo at this day ſome are found, 'who arguing falſly, and not well underſtanding the Di-'ſpenſation of the Church, contend that from that very 'time, the true Prieſthood has failed in the Church. For, 'ſay they, if all were ſuch, that is either guilty of Simo-'ny, or ordain'd by thoſe who were ſo, You who are now, 'whence came you, and by whom were you ordained? 'You muſt needs derive it from them, for there was no 'other way; and if ſo, then they who have ordained 'us muſt have received their Ordination from them 'who were either Simoniacks themſelves, or ordained 'by ſuch.

This is the Queſtion to which we muſt endeavour to give an Anſwer. And how does he anſwer this difficulty?

1. He ſuppoſeth that the Simoniacks no more than other Hereticks were able to conferr the Holy Ghoſt; and that therefore thoſe who were baptized by them, muſt again paſs under the impoſition of hands, as if they had been baptized by *Arians*.

2. He

2. He maintains, That the Sacraments confer'd by Simoniacks are null and void, and embraceth the Opinion of those who in *Gregory* VII. time obstinately maintained this Doctrine, in the case of Simoniacks and married Priests.

3. He asserts, That there were alwaies some or other that were not guilty of Simony, though perhaps it was not known.

Maurus Marchisio Dean of *Mont Cassin*, makes this observation upon the foregoing passage of St. *Bruno*, in the last page of his Second Tome, *Number* 12. 'You proceed '(saith he) to the second reason of the deficiency of the 'Book, which we endeavour to defend, which is concer-'ning the Sacraments administred by Simoniacks and He-'reticks, which the Author maintains to be null and void, 'and therefore determines, that they are not to be look'd 'upon as good and valid, but ought to be repeated. The 'Author indeed confesseth, that some Sacraments of Simo-'niacks and Hereticks are valid, and need not to be re-'peated, to wit, those which with a good intent are recei-'ved from the hand of an unknown Simoniack or Here-'tick. By which means he obviates the Calumnies of some, who from this position, That the Sacraments of Simoniacks are void, would prove, that the Priesthood had failed in the Church ever since the time of *Leo* IX. because, as he saith, in the Life of the same *Leo*, where he mentions this Calumny, That there was scarce one to be found in the Church who was not either a Simoniack himself, or ordained by such as were; Whence it followed, That if all Simoniacal Ordination was void, That there was not one true Bishop left in the Church that could conferr good and valid Orders, nor any Priest that was duly and lawfully ordained: For they argued thus; If at the time of *Leo* IX. all were either Simoniacks or ordained by such, whence then are you who now are? You must needs derive your Ordination from these Simoniacks: for there is no other way, for they who ordained you, were ordained by them.

Now

Now, to answer this Objection, St. *Bruno* was unwilling to interrupt his Narrative of the Acts of *Leo* IX, but promised to do it in a Treatise apart, which he accordingly made, and which we here endeavour to answer. Towards the end of this Treatise he concludes, That these Objectors were mistaken, because at that time there were many conceal'd Simoniacks, of whom many received their Ordination with a good intent, whose Ordination consequently was not void, but valid. But he concludes the contrary, concerning Orders conferr'd by a known Simoniack; for those he maintains to be invalid, and that consequently they ought to be repeated. And such he supposeth that some (though not all the) Ordinations then were.

Now this, though it were written without all doubt by the Author, out of his great zeal against the Simoniacks, is not to be admitted, except only in that sence wherein most Laws declare Simoniacal Ordinations to be invalid. Which the Doctors expound concerning the Nullity of Ordination, as to the function and execution of those Orders; or as far as they can be made void by the Church, by denying a lawful exercise of Orders to a Simoniack; or with respect to Right or Jurisdiction, if the same be necessary to any function; and that it doth appear, that the Church was simoniacally robbed of the same; or lastly, with respect to the obtaining of a Benefice, which the Church refuseth to allow as valid, if the same be simoniacally procured. *Suarez* exactly clears all these points, *lib. de Simon. cap. 97. à num. 2.* but that Ordination, though simoniacally conferr'd, and the Sacrament though simoniacally administred, in it self considered, is valid, is not at all to be doubted of, as being at large confirmed not only by *Suarez* in the same place, *Num.* 3, & 4, but also long since by *Bernaldus Presbyter* in his Letter to *Bernard*, the Master of the Schools of *Constance*, who was afterwards Monk of *Corby* in *Saxony*, and was of the same opinion we here set down: And the same was also the Judgment of the Famous *Guido* (of whom *Baronius* makes mention *ad ann.* 1022.) according to the testimony

of the ſame *Bernaldus*, commending on the other hand *Petrus Damianus*, who in his Book, which he entitles *Gratiſſimus*, demonſtrates, That Ordination may be convey'd by Simoniacks and Hereticks as well as by others.

Thus we ſee what pains we muſt take to make the Opinions of the Popiſh Divines, to accord with thoſe of our Modern Schoolmen; and if one ſhould endeavour to do it, yet will it be impoſſible to avoid the Conſequences of thoſe Opinions. And indeed it was only from the ſequel of theſe Opinions, which reigned above 200 years, that the Pope's Creatures have pretended, that thoſe who had been depoſed in *Italy*, by the unjuſt Laws of Popes, were become Laicks, uncapable of adminiſtring the Sacraments, or impoſing of hands; all this ſo extravagantly, that if once we admit of theſe Principles, it will follow, firſt, That all thoſe who were ordained by Simoniacks, were never made Prieſts; and that thoſe who were ordained by married perſons, did not receive any ſacred Orders: The firſt of theſe puts the Church of *Rome* into a terrible condition, for we defie the moſt able of their Doctors to make it appear, that their Popes were not Simoniacks; they who have had a like Ordination for divers Ages, and holding it only from the approbation of the Emperors, either of the *Eaſt* or *Weſt*. The other is confounded by the Confeſſion of the whole Church of *Rome*, who owns the Miniſtry of the Greek Church to be lawful, as well as of other Eaſtern Churches, where we know that the Miniſters have been married, and are ſo ſtill.

However, thus much is evident, 1. That after the ſeparation of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, the Biſhops, which *Rome* called Hereticks, becauſe of their pretended Simony, and their being married, continued ſtill in the Exerciſe of their Functions, without troubling themſelves about the Papal Definitions or Excommunications.

2. That the re-union of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, with the Pope, about the year 1134. was at the beſt but very imperfect, they of *Milan* being very wavering; as may be ſeen from the 131. Epiſtle of St. *Bernard*, who was the Pro-

Promoter of that re-union, in order to advance the Intereſt of the Emperor *Lotharius* againſt *Conrard*, and thoſe who took part with *Conrad* againſt *Lotharius*, and who continued in their Averſion to the other Papal Errors.

3. That theſe Eccleſiaſticks and People of *Italy* being thus reduc'd to a contemptible condition, by reaſon of their ſmall number, in compariſon of the Body of the Dioceſs, continued in that ſeparated ſtate, exerciſing their Miniſtry as formerly they did.

4. That they who had embrac'd the Papal Party, look'd upon them only as meer Laicks, who had no authority either to preach the Goſpel or adminiſter the Sacraments.

5. That after once this charge had been advanced againſt them, the ſame was obſtinately carried on and continued, upon very ridiculous Prejudices, which have been for a long time maintained by the greateſt of the Schoolmen; as *Morinus* proves in his Treatiſe of Ordinations, though at length they have thought fit to quit them. *De Sac. Ordin. Part 3. Exerc. 5. c. 1.*

6. That this Charge was fortified by the joining of ſome of *Waldo*'s Diſciples with the Churches of *Italy*; as I have made it appear by the Treatiſe of *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud*.

I would conclude this Chapter, if I were not aware only of two or three Objections that may be made againſt what I have here alledged, and I think my ſelf bound to prevent them, becauſe they ſeem to carry ſome weight along with them.

The Firſt is, That the Biſhops of *Italy*, which by the Court of *Rome* were called Schiſmaticks, for their adhering to the Intereſt of the Archbiſhops of *Milan*, were ſo far from eſpouſing the Opinions of *Berengarius*, that the Council of *Brixia*, which depoſed *Gregory* VII. in the year 1080, mentions this for one of the Crimes whereof he was accuſed, that he was of *Berengarius*'s Opinion; as appears from the Writings of Cardinal *Benno* againſt *Gregory* VII. and of *Conradus Urſpergenſis*.

The Second is, That the Queſtion of Schiſm being terminated at *Milan*, by the mediation of St. *Bernard* in 1134, we do not find that the Biſhops of *Italy*, or of *Lombardy* in particular, did continue ſeparate from the Communion of *Rome*, it being on the contrary very probable, that they were all of them again reconciled to the ſame; ſo that none of them join'd with the *Paterines*, or with thoſe to whom that name was given in the Dioceſs of *Italy*.

It will be an eaſie matter to ſatisfie theſe Objections. As for the firſt, I own that the Council of *Brixia* accuſed *Gregory* VII. of Berengarianiſm; but I deny, that thoſe of the Dioceſs of *Italy* conſtituted the Body of that Council; the greateſt part of thoſe who aſſiſted at it were *Germans*, who made it their buſineſs to follow the footſteps of the Synod of Nineteen Biſhops, which was held at *Mentz* the year before upon the ſame account: Neither can it be lookt upon as a ſtrange thing, that their buſineſs being to depoſe *Gregory* VII, who was the great Enemy of the Dioceſs of *Italy*, they ſhould all of them equally concurr, without oppoſition, to have him depoſed, for ſeveral Crimes mentioned in their Judgment paſt upon him; though ſome *Italians* might at the ſame time believe, that he was unjuſtly accuſed of Hereſie, for embracing the Sentiments of *Berengarius*, from which, as I have elſewhere made out from his Commentary upon St. *Matthew*, he did not ſeem to be very averſe.

Præfat. ad Joan. Paris Determin. de corpore & ſang. Chriſti.

Neither is the ſecond Difficulty any better grounded. I know well, that after that re-union, the Popes endeavoured to their utmoſt to engage the Biſhops of *Italy* to be of their Party, as well as thoſe of *Milan*, and other Lords of the Country, who began to diſown the Power of the Emperors. But they who are vers'd in the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, may eaſily obſerve, that the Council which condemned *Berengarius* had been very probably on purpoſe conven'd at *Verceil*, in the Dioceſs of *Italy*, becauſe there were many Biſhops in that Country, of *Berengarius*'s Opinion, *Sigebert* having taken notice, that there were many that pleaded for him, though the overſwaying number of his Adverſaries carried it at laſt.

They

They may conclude the same from the printed Account we have in the Council, instead of the Acts of the Roman Council, in 1079. under *Gregory* VII. against *Berengarius*. This account we have also in the Chronicle of *Verdun*, written by *Hugo Flaviniacensis*, which hath these words: *Omnibus igitur in Ecclesia servatoris congregatis, habitus est sermo de corpore & sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, multis hæc, nonnullis illa* [prius] *sentientibus. Maxima siquidem pars panem & vinum per sacra orationis verba & sacerdotis consecrationem, spiritu sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicum de Virgine natum, quod & in cruce pependit & in sanguinem qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea asserebat* [atque authoritatibus orthodoxorum patrum tam Græcorum quam Latinorum modis omnibus defendebat.] *Quidam verò cæcitate nimia & longa perculsi figuram tantum* * *substantiale illud corpus in dextera patris sedens esse, seque & alios decipientes quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere. Verum ubi cœpit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventum fuerit in* * *Synodo, defuit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus sancti ignis* * *emolumenta palearum consumens, & fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans nocte caliginem verti in lucem.*

T. 10 *Conc. edit. Lab. p.* 379

This word *Prius* is not in the MS. of *M. Theyer*, which is now in the hand of my L. Bishop of *London*.

These words are not in the MS

*The MS adds *atque subst.*

* *MS. Synodum*

* *MS. elementa.*

This is the Account of what was done in that Council; and it appears from the MS. of the Council which I have examined, that those who published it have altered it just as they pleased themselves.

Now, whatever pains they may have taken in this matter, yet it is manifest, *First*, That *Berengarius* was not the first Author of this Opinion in *Italy*, from whence the greatest part of those Bishops were summoned to the Council by *Gregory* VII. *Secondly*, That this Council was at first mightily divided, and that Division lasted for two daies, and was not taken up till the third day. *Thirdly*, That the word of *long blindness*, which the Author of this account speaks of, could not be referr'd to the Disciples of *Berengarius*, but to those who maintained the same Doctrine with him in *Italy*, since the contrary Doctrin being set forth by *Paschasius Radbertus*, gave occasion to the Division upon that matter, of which *Joannes Scotus*'s Book, that was burnt in *Verceil*, was an authentick Testimony.

Moreover

Moreover, they cannot be ignorant how that Dioceſs was laid waſte by the Forces of the Emperor *Frederick Barbaroſſa*, which gave occaſion to the Clergy to enjoy a greater liberty in their Opinions, the four Antipopes, who ſucceeded one another, troubling themſelves about little elſe, but who ſhould have the maſtery; and thoſe who are lookt upon as the true Popes, being not in a condition to concern themſelves with ought, but what might be for their own defence againſt the Antipopes, who were ſupported by that Emperor.

The Third Objection is this: That whatſoever we cannot point to thoſe preciſely, who have ſucceeded to the Biſhops, who ſeparated themſelves in this Dioceſs of *Italy* from the Communion with the Popes, ſince the year 1134. when the Dioceſs of *Milan* was reconciled with them, by the endeavours of St. *Bernard*.

But yet, as I remark'd before, this is very clear, That there was nothing but an horrid diſorder and confuſion in that Dioceſs, by the Intriegues of the Popes, and by the reſiſtance of the Emperors.

Whoſoever will look only on the Succeſſion of the Biſhops of *Milan*, in thoſe times, will meet with ſo great uncertainty in their Succeſſion, many pretending to the ſame Title, that there was nothing more common in that Dioceſs, than Queſtions upon Elections of Biſhops or other Clergy-men.

Thoſe who, as *Ughellus*, look upon the Confirmation of the Pope as an eſſential thing to make an Election lawful, are forced to look upon many of the Biſhops of this Dioceſs as Intruders and Schiſmaticks, that gave occaſion to the Popes to declare theſe Ordinations null and void, and to deprive them of the name of Biſhops, Prieſt, and Deacons.

As ſince that time thoſe who favoured the Popiſh Intereſt, declared War againſt thoſe that were ordained againſt their conſent, and had their Ordination from thoſe who were rejected by the Romiſh Party as Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; we ought not to be ſurprized, if when *Rome* conſidered them as Laymen, they on the contrary may pretend

tend to have a true Ordination of Biſhops, Prieſt, and Deacons, though in the conſequence of time they thought fit to conceal their Titles to avoid, as well as they could, the Hatred and Perſecution which thoſe Titles brought upon them, from the Church of *Rome* and her Inquiſitors.

'Tis known to all the World how careful the Abettors of the Roman Party have been to deſtroy the laſt Monument of thoſe Churches which they reduced under their Yoke. If we reflect upon *England* only, we ſhall have too ſenſible inſtances of this care.

St. *Aſaph* was Biſhop of the Church called by his name, and St. *Daniel* was Biſhop of *Bangor*; we know that theſe lived in the time of *Auſtin* the Monk, and they do not doubt that they were two of the ſeven that oppoſed his Uſurpation, *Bede Hiſt. Eccleſ.* II. 2. But from that time till the Engliſh Conqueſt, (which was above 500 years after) they cannot find the name of any one of their Succeſſors, nor any name of any one Churchman in that Dioceſs The Biſhop of *Bangor* cannot name three of his Predeceſſors in that time. But of this we find ſufficient proof, That all the Records of theſe Churches were deſtroyed by the Engliſh at the time of that Conqueſt, and we do not doubt that they took eſpecial care to extinguiſh all the Memory of theſe Biſhop's Oppoſition to Popery. which we can plainly and certainly prove, did not prevail in that Country till the *Engliſh Conqueſt*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

Concerning the Perſecutions which the Waldenſes *have ſuffered ſince the XI. Century.*

WE have given an account of the true Riſe of the Name of the *Paterines*, and of the *Waldenſes*, but that true original of the word was ſoon after thruſt out by another. For, before the end of the XII. Century, the name *Paterine* paſſed for a word derived from the Latin word *Pati*, becauſe of the great Sufferings to which the Believers of *Italy* found themſelves expoſed by the violence of the Popes and Emperors, who had abandoned their Power to the Popes, to exterminate and root out whatſoever oppos'd it ſelf againſt their Authority.

And the ſame happened to the word *Vallenſes*, which ſignified nomore than *Inhabitants of the Valleys*; which their Enemies would needs derive from *Waldo*, and which at laſt they impos'd upon the *Vaudois*, as living in the *Valley of Tears*, according to the derivation which *Everard* of *Bethune* gives us of that Name. Indeed, it muſt be acknowledged, that *New Rome* has carried the Art of Perſecuting much beyond any thing that *Old Rome* ever arrived to, though ſhe ſeem'd to have attained the maſtery of that Art, after the Ten Perſecutions which ſhe carried on againſt the Chriſtians.

To judge of this, we need only take notice of ſome Laws, which have ſerv'd for a Rule to the Perſecutors, how they were to behave themſelves therein. The firſt Law I have here ſet down, is equally levell'd againſt the *Paterines*, and the Poor of *Lions*, maliciouſly confounding them with the *Manichees*, that ſo they might appear the more execrable in the Eyes of the People. It was publiſhed by Pope *Lucius* III. *Cap. ad Abolendam.*

The

The Decree of Pope Lucius III. *againſt Hereticks.*

'TO aboliſh the malignity of divers Hereſies, which 'of late time are ſprung up in moſt parts of the 'World, 'tis but fitting that the Power committed to 'the Church ſhould be awakened, that by the concurring 'aſſiſtance of the Imperial Strength, both the Inſolence 'and Malapertneſs of the Hereticks, in their falſe deſigns, 'may be cruſhed, and the Truth of Catholick Simplicity 'ſhining forth in the Holy Church, may demonſtrate her 'pure and free from the execrableneſs of their falſe Do'ctrines. Wherefore we being ſupported by the Preſence 'and Power of our moſt dear Son *Frederick*, *the moſt Illu'ſtrious Emperor of the* Romans, *alwaies Encreaſer of the Em'pire*, with the common Advice and Counſel of our Bre'thren, and other Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, and many Prin'ces, who from ſeveral parts of the World are met to'gether, do ſet our ſelves againſt theſe Hereticks, who 'have got different names from the ſeveral falſe Doctrines 'they profeſs, by the Sanction of this preſent general De'cree, and by our Apoſtolical Authority, according to the 'Tenor of theſe preſents, we condemn all manner of 'Hereſie, by what Name ſoever it may be denomi'nated.

'More particularly we declare, all *Cathari*, *Paterines*, and 'thoſe who call themſelves the *Humbled*, or *Poor of Lions*, '*Paſſagines*, *Joſephines*, *Arnoldiſts*, to lie under a perpetual '*Anathema*: And becauſe ſome under a form of Godlineſs, '*but denying the power thereof*, as the Apoſtle ſaith, aſſume 'to themſelves the Authority of Preaching; whereas the 'ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *How ſhall they preach, except they be ſent?* 'We therefore conclude under the ſame ſentence of a per'petual *Anathema*, all thoſe who either being forbid or not 'ſent, do notwithſtanding preſume to preach publickly or 'privately, without any Authority received either from 'the Apoſtolick See, or from the Biſhops of their reſpe-

'ctive Dioceſſes: As likewiſe all thoſe who are not afraid 'to hold or teach any Opinions concerning the Sacrament 'of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, 'Baptiſm, the Remiſſion of Sins, Matrimony, or any 'other Sacraments of the Church, differing from what the 'Holy Church of *Rome* doth preach and obſerve: And 'generally all thoſe whom the ſame Church of *Rome*, or 'the ſeveral Biſhops in their Dioceſſes, with the advice 'of their Clergy, or the Clergy themſelves, in caſe of a 'vacancy of the See, with the Advice, if need be, of 'neighbouring Biſhops, ſhall judge to be Hereticks. And 'we likewiſe declare all Entertainers and Defenders of the 'ſaid Hereticks, and thoſe that have ſhewed any Favour, 'or given Countenance to them, thereby ſtrengthening 'them in their Hereſie, whether they be called *Comforted*, '*Believers*, or *Perfect*, or with whatſoever ſuperſtitious 'Names they diſguiſe themſelves, to be liable to the ſame 'Sentence.

'And though it ſometime happens, that the Severity of 'Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, neceſſary to the coercion of 'Sin, is condemn'd by thoſe who do not underſtand the 'vertue of it, we notwithſtanding by theſe Preſents de-'cree, That whoſoever ſhall be notoriouſly convicted of 'theſe Errors, if a Clergy-man, or one that endeavours 'to conceal himſelf under any Religious Order, he ſhall be 'immediately deprived of all prerogative of the Church-'Orders, and ſo being diveſted of all Office and Benefice, 'be delivered up to the Secular Power, to be puniſhed 'according to demerit, unleſs immediately upon his being 'detected, he voluntarily returns to the Truth of the Ca-'tholick Faith, and ſubmits publickly to abjure his Errors, 'at the diſcretion of the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, and to 'make ſuitable ſatisfaction. And as for a Lay-man, who 'ſhall be found guilty either publickly or privately of any 'of the aforeſaid Crimes, unleſs by abjuring his Hereſie, and 'making ſatisfaction, he immediately returns to the Ortho-'dox Faith; we decree him to be left to the Sentence of 'the ſecular Judge, to receive condign Puniſhment, according 'to the quality of his Offence.

'And

'And as for thoſe who are taken notice of by the Church 'as ſuſpected of Hereſie, except at the Biſhop's Command 'they give full evidence of their Innocence, according to 'the degree of ſuſpicion againſt them, and quality of their 'Perſons, they ſhall all be liable to the ſame Sentence. 'But thoſe who after having abjur'd their Errors, or clear'd 'themſelves upon Examination, to their Biſhop, ſhall be found 'to have relaps'd into their abjur'd Hereſie; we decree, That 'without any further hearing they be forthwith delivered up 'to the Secular Power, and their Goods confiſcated to the 'uſe of the Church.

'And we further decree, That this Excommunication, in 'which our Will is, That all Hereticks be included, be 'by all Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, and Biſhops, renewed and 'repeated in all the chief Feſtivals, and on any publick 'Solemnity, or upon any other occaſion, to the Glory of 'God, and the putting a ſtop to all Heretical Pravity; 'ordering by our Apoſtolical Authority, that if any Biſhop 'be found wanting or ſlow herein, he be ſuſpended for 'three years, from his Epiſcopal Dignity and Admini-'ſtration.

'Furthermore, with the Counſel and Advice of Bi-'ſhops, and Intimation of the Emperor and Princes of 'the Empire, we do add, That every Archbiſhop or Bi-'ſhop, either in his own perſon, or by his Archdeacon, 'or by other honeſt and fit Perſons, ſhall once or twice 'in the year viſit the Pariſh in which it is reported that 'Hereticks dwell, and there cauſe two or three men 'of good credit, or if need be, the whole Neighbourhood, 'to ſwear, that if they know of any Hereticks there, or 'any that frequent private Meetings, or differ from the 'common Converſation of Mankind, either in Life or 'Manners, they will ſignifie the ſame to the Biſhop or 'Archdeacon: The Biſhop alſo or Archdeacon ſhall ſum-'mon before them the Parties accuſed, who except they 'at their diſcretion, according to the Cuſtom of the Coun-'try, do clear themſelves of the guilt laid to their charge; 'or if after having ſo cleared themſelves, they relapſe again 'to their former Unbelief, ſhall be puniſhed at the Biſhop's

'diſcretion. And if any of them, by a damnable Su-
'perſtition, ſhall refuſe to ſwear, that alone ſhall ſuffice
'to make them Hereticks convict, and liable to the Puniſh-
'ments before mentioned.

'We ordain further, That all Earls, Barons, Governors,
'and Conſuls of Cities, and other places, in purſuance of
'the Commonition of the reſpective Archbiſhops and Bi-
'ſhops, ſhall promiſe upon Oath, that in all theſe parti-
'culars, whenever they are thereto required, they will
'powerfully and effectually aſſiſt the Church againſt He-
'reticks, and their complices, and endeavour faithfully, ac-
'cording to their Office and Power, to execute the Ec-
'cleſiaſtical and Imperial Statutes concerning the matters
'herein mentioned.

'But if any of them ſhall refuſe to obſerve this, they
'ſhall be deprived of their Honours and Charges, and be
'rendred incapable of receiving others, and moreover be
'involved in the ſentence of Excommunication, and their
'Goods be confiſcated to the uſe of the Church. And
'if any City ſhall refuſe to yield Obedience to theſe De-
'cretal Conſtitutions, or that contrary to the Epiſcopal
'Commonition they ſhall neglect to puniſh Oppoſers, we
'ordain the ſame to be excluded from all Commerce
'with other Cities, and to be deprived of the Epiſcopal
'Dignity.

'We likewiſe decree, That all Favourers of Hereticks,
'as men ſtigmatiz'd with perpetual Infamy, ſhall be inca-
'pable of being Attorneys or Witneſſes, or of bearing
'any publick Office whatſoever. And as for thoſe who
'are exempt from the Law of *Dioceſan* Juriſdiction, as
'being immediately under the Juriſdiction of the Apoſto-
'lick See; nevertheleſs as to theſe Conſtitutions againſt
'Hereticks, we will, That they be ſubject to the Judgment
'of the Archbiſhop and Biſhops, and that in this caſe they
'yield Obedience to them, as to the Delegates of the
'Apoſtolick See, the immunity of their Priviledges not-
'withſtanding.

Hde-

Ildephonſus alſo, King of *Arragon*, teſtified his Zeal againſt the *Waldenſes*, by his Edict publiſhed in the year 1194, which was printed by *Pegna*, in his Notes upon the *Directory of Inquiſitors*. Part 2. q. 14. p. 281.

The Edict of King Ildephonſus, *againſt the* Waldenſian *Hereticks, Commanding them to depart his Kingdom.*

'ILdephonſus, *by the Grace of God, King of* Arragon, *Earl of* Barcelona, *Marqueſs of* Provence, *to all Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and other Prelates of the Church of* G O D, *Earls, Viſcounts, Knights, and to all People of his Kingdom, or belonging to his Dominions, wiſheth Health, and the ſound Obſervance of Chriſtian Religion.*

'Foraſmuch as it has pleaſed God to ſet Us over his 'People, it is but fit and juſt, that according to our Might 'we ſhould be continually ſollicitous for the welfare and 'defence of the ſame; wherefore we, in imitation of our 'Anceſtors, and obedience to the Canons, which determin 'and ordain Hereticks, as perſons caſt out from the ſight 'of God and all Catholicks, to be condemned and perſe-'cuted every where; do command and charge the *Walden-'ſes, Inzabbati*, who otherwiſe are called the *Poor of Lions*, 'and all other Hereticks, who cannot be numbred, being 'excommunicated from the Holy Church, Adverſaries to 'the Croſs of Chriſt, Violaters and Corrupters of the 'Chriſtian Religion, and the avow'd Enemies of us and 'our Kingdom, to depart out of our Kingdom and all our 'Dominions. Whoſoever therefore from this day for-'wards ſhall preſume to receive the ſaid *Waldenſes* and '*Zapatati*, or any other Hereticks, of whatſoever Pro-'feſſion, into their Houſes, or to be preſent at their per-'nicious Sermons, or to afford them Meat, or any other 'favour, ſhall incurr thereby the Indignation of Almighty

'God,

'God, as well as ours, and have his Goods confiſcated, 'without the remedy of an Appeal, and be puniſhed as 'if he were actually guilty of High Treaſon. And we 'ſtrictly charge and command, that this our Edict and per- 'petual Conſtitution be publickly read on the Lord's days 'by the Biſhops and other Rectors of Churches, in all the 'Cities, Caſtles, and Towns of our Kingdom, and through- 'out all our Dominions: And that the ſame be obſerved 'by Vicars, Bailiffs, Juſtices, *Merins*, and *Zenalmedins*, and all 'the People in general; and the aforeſaid Puniſhment be 'inflicted upon all Tranſgreſſors.

'We will further, That if any perſon, noble or ignoble, 'ſhall in any part of our Dominions find any of theſe wicked 'wretches, who ſhall be known to have had three days 'notice of this our Edict, that do not forthwith depart, 'but rather obſtinately ſtaying or lingring, ſhall any way 'plague, deſpitefully uſe or diſtreſs them, (wounding un- 'to death, and maiming of them only excepted) he will 'in ſo doing, act nothing but what will be very grateful 'and pleaſing to us, and ſhall be ſo far from fearing to 'incurr any Penalty thereby, that he may be ſure rather 'to deſerve our Favour. Furthermore we do afford to 'theſe wicked Miſcreants reſpite (though this may in ſome 'ſort ſeem contrary to our Duty and Reaſon) till the day 'after *All Saints* day; but that all thoſe who either ſhall 'not be gone by that time, or at leaſt preparing for their 'departure, ſhall be ſpoiled, beaten, cudgel'd, and ſhame- 'fully and ill entreated.

'The Seal ✠ of *Ildephonſus* King of *Arragon*, Earl of *Bar- 'celona*, and Marqueſs of *Provence*. The Seal ✠ of *Peter* 'King of *Arragon*, and Earl of *Barcelona*, in the original of 'this Paper. And the Seal of Lord *Regimund* Archbiſhop 'of *Tarracona*, and Lord *G.* Biſhop of *Tiraſſona*, and Lord '*R.* Biſhop of *Jacca*. This was copied at *Ilerda* by *William* '*de Baſtia* the King's Notary, *Ann. Dom.* MCXCIV. and 'compared with the Original; witneſs *Martinus de Scribas*, 'Notary.

Inno-

Innocent III. caus'd ſearch to be made after them in all places. We have a Letter of his, writ to thoſe of *Metz*, where he ordains them to be driven out and perſecuted with the extreameſt Barbarity, becauſe they took the liberty to read the Scripture tranſlated by *Peter Waldo*, into the vulgar Tongue.

Honorius III. obliged the Emperor *Frederick* II. to publiſh that terrible Law which we find at the end of the Book *De Feudis*, in the Civil Law, and which has ſince ſerved for a Rule to the Inquiſitors, as well as given them their Authority. Which Law is as follows.

'FREDERICK, *by the Grace of God, Emperor of the* 'Romans, *always Encreaſer of the Empire, To all Mar-* 'queſſes, *Earls, and all People under our Government, Health* 'and *Grace.*

'Foraſmuch as nothing can conduce more to the Ho-'nour of the Empire and Praiſe of the Emperor, than by 'the purging away of Error, and the abrogating of ſome 'unjuſt Statutes, to procure the peaceable and flouriſhing 'ſtate of the Church of God, and ſecure her Liberty.

'We do condemn to perpetual Infamy . . . . . 'the *Cathari*, *Paterines*, *Leoniſts*, *Speroniſts*, *Arnoldiſts*, *Circum-* 'ciſed, and all other Hereticks of both Sexes, by what 'Names ſoever they are called, commanding their Goods 'to be confiſcated, ſo as never to return to them again, 'or by way of Inheritance to devolve to their Children; 'ſince it is a much more hainous Crime to offend the 'Majeſty of the Eternal God, than any Temporal Prince. 'And as for thoſe who are only ſuſpected of Hereſie, ex-'cept at the Command of the Church, according to the 'degree of Suſpicion and quality of the Perſon, they make 'their Innocence to appear by a ſufficient Vindication of 'themſelves, ſhall be accounted infamous and outlaw'd; 'and if they continue ſo for a whole year, we condemn 'them for Hereticks.

'We

'We also ordain by this perpetual Edict, That all that 'are in Authority, Consuls and Rectors, whatsoever their 'Office may be, do publickly take an Oath, for defence 'of the Faith, that they will faithfully endeavour, to the 'utmost of their power, to exterminate all Hereticks, in 'the places subject to their Jurisdiction; so that from hence-'forward, as soon as any one shall be taken into any 'Place of Power, either perpetual or temporary, he shall 'be obliged to swear to this Article; and that in case of 'failure, they shall neither be accounted persons in Power 'or Consuls; and we from thence forward declare all 'their Acts and Sentences null and void.

'And in case that any Temporal Lord being required 'and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge 'his Territories from Heretical Pravity, after a whole year 'elapsed from the time of his admonition, we give leave 'to Catholicks to possess themselves of his Lands, who 'after having rooted out the Hereticks, shall quietly pos-'sess the same, and preserve it in Piety. Provided always 'that the Rights of the principal Lord of the Fee be preser-'ved . . . . . 'but that the foresaid Law shall be wholly in force against 'those who have no such superiour Lords of the Fee.

'Moreover, we proscribe all Hereticks, Entertainers and 'Favourers of Hereticks, firmly ordaining, that as soon as 'any such, being excommunicated by the Church, shall 'contemptuously refuse to make satisfaction within a years 'time, that then he be made infamous by Law, and un-'capable of any Office, or of being a Member of any 'Council, or of having a Voice in the choice of Offi-'cers, or being a Witness: That moreover he be depri-'ved of the power of making a Will, and of succeeding 'into an Inheritance. Furthermore, that no body shall 'be bound to answer to his Complaint or Charge, but 'he be obliged to answer the Charge of others against 'him: And if he be a Judge, that his Sentence be of no 'force, and that no Causes be brought before him; if he 'be a Lawyer, that his Pleading be not admitted; and

'if

'if a Scrivener, that the Writings drawn up by him be 'invalid.

'And we *Honorius* Biſhop, Servant of the Servants of 'God, do praiſe, approve, and confirm theſe Laws, to 'continue for ever, which are made by *Frederick* Emperor 'of the *Romans*, our deareſt Son, for the Good of all 'Chriſtians. And in caſe any man, by a preſumptuous 'attempt, being inſtigated thereto by the Enemy of Man-'kind, ſhall any way endeavour the infraction of them, 'let him be aſſured, that by ſo doing he will incurr the 'indignation of Almighty God, and of the Bleſſed Apo-'ſtles *Peter* and *Paul*.

We may take a gueſs from hence of the Miſeries theſe Chriſtians have been expoſed to, who from the time of theſe bloody Edicts ſcarce enjoy'd the leaſt Interval of Reſt. And we may add alſo the ſettling of the Inquiſition, which was introduc'd with the Title of an Office by *Gregory* IX. They who will take the pains to conſult the Annals of the Church of *Rome*, will find, that from the XIII. Century her Purple hath been died in the Blood of the *Waldenſes* and *Paterines*. The Primitive Chriſtian Church ſuffered Ten Perſecutions, but moſt of them at conſiderable Intervals, and their whole continuance was not at the moſt above 250 years; and it hath been demonſtrated, that the number of the Martyrs was not exceſſive. But *Rome* now can vaunt it ſelf to have almoſt continually maintain'd a Perſecution againſt theſe Churches of *Italy*, and to have carried it on to that degree, that there are none of them now to be found in their own Country, except thoſe ſhe locks up in her Dungeons, and reſerves for capital Puniſhments. *Dodwel. Diſſert. Cyprian.*

My deſign is not to draw the Picture of theſe Cruelties, ſince *Rome* has monopoliz'd the Trade of Perſecution; he that would undertake this, ought to be furniſht with the Regiſters of the Inquiſitors, who have been the Executioners of the Bloody Sentences of that Tribunal, in all the places where the Churches of *Piedmont*, have ſpread their Faith, by planting of their Colonies. I ſhall only

make ſome few Obſervations upon this matter, which may give us a compendious view of the horridneſs of the Inquiſitor's Proceedings.

Firſt, They have not omitted any Cruelty, whereby they might find a pretence of running them down, as perſons of moſt abominable Lives. They have put them to Tortures in vaſt numbers, both Men and Women, to force them to confeſs, That in their Aſſemblies they committed Filthineſs againſt Nature. Hereof we have an illuſtrious Example in *Perrin*, *Chap.* 7. which is a pregnant
p. 203. Proof, that the Spirit of Paganiſm is by Tranſmigration paſſed into the Church of *Rome*.

Secondly, They have made uſe of a Deviliſh Cheat, to make People believe that they were guilty by their own Confeſſion. There is a memorable Example of this in
p. 127. the year 1487. recorded by *Perrin*, *Chap.* 3. in theſe words:

'I took notice of an extraordinary piece of Villany in 'a Proceſs formed by the Monk *Veiletty*; for having the 'aforeſaid Proceſs in my hand, we found the ſhort *Bil*-'*lets* in which the aforeſaid Commiſſary took the Anſwers 'of the Accuſed ſimply, as they came from his Mouth, 'but we have found them afterwards enlarged in the Pro-'ceſs, and often quite contrary to what was taken from 'his mouth, by changing the Intention of the Accuſed, 'and making him ſay thoſe things, of which he never 'thought. As for example; When he was asked, whether 'he believes, that after the words in the Sacrament of the 'Maſs, pronounced by the Prieſt, the Body of Chriſt was 'in the Hoſt, large and extended, as it was upon the Croſs? 'and the *Vaudois* anſwered, That it was not; *Viletty* fra-'med his anſwer thus: That he had confeſſed, that he did 'not believe in God, or at the leaſt, his Scribe by his 'order. Alſo they asked him if the Saints were to be 'invocated? he anſwered, Not: And they framed it in 'writing, That he had curſed and ſpoke evil of the Saints. 'He was asked, if the Virgin *Mary* was to be worſhip-'ped, and to be prayed unto in our neceſſity? he anſwered, 'No:

'No: They write, That he had ſpoken Blaſphemy againſt 'the Virgin *Mary*. Behold the fidelity of the aforeſaid Monk's Inquiſitors, of ſo important an action.

This was not without a conſiderable Providence of God, that the memory of theſe Wickedneſſes have been preſerved unto this preſent, that it may be ſeen with what Spirit they were acted, who having the power of killing and deſtroying, made uſe of ſuch Impoſtures, to make them more odious under the burthen of ſuch Calamities.

Perrin gives an account how he was informed of thoſe Villanies, that when *Ambrun* was taken in the year 1588. by the Mareſchal of *Leſdiguieres*, thoſe Proceſſes that were kept in original in the Houſe of the Biſhop, were obtained from a famous man, *Calignon*, Chancellor of *Navarra*, and were put in the hands of *M. Wulçon* Counſellor in the Parliament of *Grenoble*, from whom he had a view of them.

Thoſe Proceſſes were put afterwards in the hand of Mr. *Morland*, and are now in the publick Library of the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, from whence I thought fit to make an Extract in the next Chapter, and at the end of this Book to juſtifie what was aſſerted by *Perrin* with ſo much aſſurance.

The Reader may compare the Billet and the Proceſs, and thereby judge of the honeſty of the Inquiſitors, and whether I was obliged to review with concern ſuch villanous and wicked Calumnies.

Thirdly, They have employed the Fury of Souldiers, and the Cruelty of Executioners to root them out.

Fourthly, Theſe great Accuſers of the *Waldenſes*, as being unclean and filthy People, have made uſe of the Inquiſition to raviſh their Wives and their Daughters; as one may ſee in the Hiſtory of *Perrin*, *Chap 7.* p. 204.

Fifthly, They have exerciſed their Cruelties even upon thoſe whom the Rage of the moſt barbarous Wars is wont to ſpare, old Men, Women, and ſucking Children.

Sixthly, They have involved in the ſame Puniſhments with them, all thoſe who ſpoke the leaſt word in favour of them. As may be ſeen in many inſtances.

Seventhly, They have obliged Princes to break the Treaties they had made with this poor People, when forced by the extremity of their Violences, they undertook their own defence, forcing their Adversaries to come to a Treaty with them.

Those that are desirous to be more particularly informed concerning the Behaviour of the Inquisitors, need only peruse their Directory, printed at *Rome* 1593. by order of *Gregory* XIII, and from thence may easily judge how they behaved themselves in the Persecution of these poor Christians in 1375, which *Spondanus* mentions, in that of 1380, stirred up by *Borelli* the Monk, mentioned by *Leger*; in that of 1400, set down by the same Author; in that of 1460, which he mentions, which continued until the year 1487, under the conduct of the *Franciscan* Frier *Veyletti*; in that of 1488, under *Innocent* VIII. carried on by *Albert de Capitaneis*, and continued by *Plorreri* a *Franciscan* mentioned by *Leger*; in that of 1494, managed by *Antonius Fabry*; in that of 1506, under *Lewis* XII; in that of 1532, by *Pantaleon Berser*, mentioned by *Leger*; in the year 1540, & 1541, in which were involved those of *Cabrieres*, *Merindol*, and the neighbouring places; in the years 1560, & 1561, and I do not know in how many more, which are mentioned by the *Jacobines* in the Annals of their Order.

Ad ann. 1375. §.

p. 115.

p. 116. p. 117.

p. 129. 131.

p. 156.

But we may form a truer Judgment of their Sufferings, by four very memorable new instances, the first of which is, the desolation & destruction of the Churches of *Pragela* in *Dauphiné*, in the year 1545, under *Francis* I. The History of the Destruction of *Cabrieres* and *Merindol*, is as remarkable and notorious in *France* as the *Parisian* Massacre. *Sleidan* hath writ the History of it in his Book, and *Thuanus* has confirm'd whatever he has writ concerning it. The Speech of Monsieur *Aubery de Maurier*, Attorney of the French King, touching the same matter, is still in being, which is capable of drawing Tears from the Eyes of *Cannibals* themselves, and the most enraged Dragoons.

The

The Second is, The Deſtruction of their Churches in *Bohemia*, by *Ferdinand* II, whereof we have an account printed in 1648.

The Third is, The Perſecution, or rather Deſolation which happened in 1655, in our days, and which is ſet down by Sir *Samuel Morland*, and Monſieur *Leger* Paſtor of thoſe Valleys.

The Fourth is, The Buſineſs of 1686, which cauſed the total ruine of thoſe Churches, and the diſperſion of the Inhabitants of the Valleys: A ſhort account whereof was printed at the Theatre at *Oxford*, in 1688.

CHAP. XXVI.

An Inſtance of the Calumnies of ſome Inquiſitors.

THE Account given by an Inquiſitor, in one of the foregoing Chapters, of the Belief and Conduct of the *Waldenſes*, clearly proves the intolerable Impudence of thoſe who have charged them with horrid and deteſtable Calumnies, both as to Faith and Manners. But becauſe ſome may be impoſed upon by the Informations againſt the *Waldenſes*, where their aim was to expoſe them; and to make them odious, I am willing to give here an inſtance of the honeſty and upright dealing of thoſe cruel Inquiſitors, as of a ſecond kind of Perſecution againſt them. And though theſe following Informations, which I am to deſcribe, were taken in *Dauphiné*, yet they wholly reſpect the *Waldenſes*, becauſe it is an acknowledged Truth, that the Inhabitants of *Dauphiné* were a Colony of thoſe of *Piedmont*; as was evident to the Sieur *du Bellay Langey*, when he went thither to take Informations concerning the Maſ-

ſacre

ſacre committed by the Preſident *D' Opede*, by order from *Francis* I.

See here an Extract of two Examinations taken in the year 1492, let the Reader compare them, and judge if the Inquiſitors have not perfectly imitated the way of the old Perſecutors, in calumniating the Primitive Chriſtians.

In the year of our Lord 1492, the 2*d.* of *Auguſt*, at *Ulcy*, the venerable *Bartholomew Paſchal* Canon, and Pidancerius, and Vicar of the Reverend *Travellis* Vicar general of the moſt Reverend Father in God, and Lord *John Michael*, by Divine Mercy Biſhop of *Praneſte*, Cardinal of St. *Angelo*, Adminiſtrator and Commendator of the famous Monaſtery of *Ulcy*, in company of the worthy and worſhipful *Poncius* of *Ponci*, Counſellor to the Lord of *Dauphiné*, and *Orancius Eme* Judge of *Embrun*, did proceed to the Examination of *Francis de Girondino* of *Spoleto*, called *Barba Martinus*, at that time a Priſoner in the Priſon of *Ulcy* in *Dauphiné*.

Firſt, he ſaid, That about 16 years ago, *Girondinus* his Father taught him the Faith and Hereſie of the *Waldenſes*, and began to lead him up and down the Countries.

Being asked through what Countries he led him, he anſwered, Through theſe ſeveral Countries of *Italy*, *Genoua*, *Bononia*, *Lucca*, *Monte Martio*, and *Ancona*; and that his Father himſelf, who was a *Barba*, went to teach and preach to the Inhabitants of thoſe Mountains.

Being farther asked, with whom he aſſociated, and in what places, and with whom he continued and converſed, he ſaid, That after the ſecond year, he went to learn the ſaid Doctrine of the *Waldenſes*, in company of another *Barba*, called *Barnovo*, who was originally of the Country about the Lake of *Perugia*, in the Lordſhip of *Camarino*, who led him up and down the aforeſaid places for two or three years together.

Being asked, Whether after that the ſaid *Barnovo* had left him, he ſtill followed the ſame Doctrine, he ſaid, That afterwards he kept company with another *Barba*, called *Joſue* of *Sancto Loco*, in the ſaid Lordſhip of *Camarino*,

rino, about three miles distant from *Charretto*, saying further, That after he had accompanied the said *Josue*, to profess and preach the said Sect in the aforesaid places, another *Barba* called *Andreas* led him to their great Master, who was called *John Anthony*, who has his residence in the Town of *Cambro*, belonging to the Pope's Dominions.

Being asked what the said great Master had said to him, saith, That he enjoined him to take an Oath, according to their Faith, and commanded him further, that he should not for any thing of the World reveal or manifest what he should say to him, telling him, That to manifest or reveal their Faith was an unpardonable Sin; adding, That if he would keep firm to that Sect, and follow it, he would do much good.

Being asked, Whether there were any more of those they called *Barbæ*, he said, There were; and that their great Master himself was called *Barba*, and said, that they all held the same Sect, and that very secretly. And he further said, That their great Master, who exhorted them to keep their Faith, and they should be saved; also preached to them, that all who should follow their Faith were saved; but that those who did not follow it, were damned.

Being demanded, which was the chief Foundation of their Sect, he said, That their great Master declared, and that their *Barbæ* found it so in wandering up and down the World, that because of the wicked and most profligate Lives of the Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, Religious, and all other Ecclesiastical Persons, the *Barbæ* follow this their Faith, and meet with an infinite number of Followers, because the said Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, and Ecclesiasticks are Leaders, and the People follow them in Avarice, Luxury, Pride, Pomp, Gluttony, and Anger, and that this is the Life of all Ecclesiasticks; and that the wicked and profligate Lives of the Clergy, was the chiefest motive of their Separation.

Saying;

Saying further, That the Clergy living thus in mortal Sin, cannot adminiſter the Sacraments, and that whatever they do, is of no efficacy; for when they are made Prieſts, they ſwear Chaſtity, Purity, and Virginity; but committing the aforeſaid Sins, they break their Faith and Oath, and ſo become the Enemies of Faith, and loſe all Virtue and Power; becauſe when a burning Candle is put out and dead, it can no more enlighten and quicken another.

He ſaith further, That there is not a Pope, Cardinal, Biſhop, or other Clergy man, that keeps not his Miſs or his *Regeſco* to lie with him.

Saying further, That his ſaid great Maſter charged them to preach, and enlarge their Faith, and to draw the People as much as in them lay to it, becauſe in ſo doing they ſhould gain Eternal Life, becauſe all of their Faith were ſaved, and the reſt damned.

He ſaith, That when their great Maſter, having call'd together the Community, has made them *Barba*, and given them Power, he changeth their Names; and that before that he was made a *Barba* by their aforeſaid Community, he was called *Francis*, but that afterwards he was called *Martin*.

He ſaith further, That the *Barba* are made or conſtituted, and there is an Office or Charge belonging to them; and that as ſoon as any one dies, another is ſubſtituted in his room.

Being asked, Whether they had any particular Provinces, in which they exerciſed their Office? he anſwered, No; but that they go up and down the World preaching.

Being asked what further Charge their great Maſter laid upon them, and what the *Barba* were uſed to preach in their journeyings up and down? he anſwered, That he ſaid, and they were wont to preach, That one God alone is to be worſhipped, who created Heaven and Earth, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and Water: and that

Being asked what their great Maſter told them [the *Barba*] concerning the Saints, and what they preach concerning them

them, he ſaid, That they believe in St. *Peter*, and next him in St. *Gregory*, and St. *Sylveſter*, and in St. *John* the Evangeliſt; but in St. *Paul* they do not believe, becauſe he was an Aſſaſſine.

Being asked why they rather believe in St. *Peter* than in St. *Paul*, he ſaith, Becauſe God hath made the ſaid St. *Peter* his Vicar or Vicegerent, and given him the Power of looſing and binding; and becauſe St. *Peter* in his Life-time wrought Miracles, therefore they believe in him amongſt the reſt.

Being asked what Miracles St. *Peter* wrought, he ſaith, That when St. *Peter* cauſed the Church of St. *Peter* to be built at *Rome*, the Devil came to him, and ſaid, I will cauſe a fairer Building to be built than you can, and in ſhorter time, and that he would do it by the next day; and a little while after, the Devil came to St. *Peter*, and ſaid, Come to the Houſe that I have made . . . . . but when you enter, be ſure you do not make the ſign of the Croſs. And ſo St. *Peter* came to take a view of the ſaid Houſe, and when he was in ſight of the ſaid Houſe, which is now called *Sancta Maria de rotunda*, with caution he made the ſign of the Croſs, laying his hand on his Beard, and ſaying, *By this holy Beard*, and then laying his hand on his Stomach, and ſaying, *By this holy Fountain*; and then on his right and left Arm, ſaying, *By theſe Shoulders, this is a fair Building*; and having, as was ſaid juſt now, made the ſign of the Croſs, the Devil would have deſtroyed the Houſe, but St. *Peter* hindred him, and adjur'd him; and becauſe St. *Peter* was got within the doors of the Church, the Devil could not get out by the Door, but ſtriking his Feet againſt the Ground, he left the mark of his footſteps, and went out by a hole which he made in the top of the Church, which hole is there ſtill, and could never ſince be cloſed: And for the ſaid Miracle, which he wrought openly to the eye, they believe in St. *Peter*, but do not believe in the other Saints, becauſe they were Sinners, and becauſe they have not ſeen any of their Miracles.

Concerning St. *John* the Baptiſt, he ſaid, That becauſe he did not deſire Grace of the Lord, he is expected, and that in the day of Judgment he ſhall intercede for all; and that it is not known whether he be in Heaven or on Earth, but that he believed he was in the Terreſtrial Paradiſe.

He ſaith further, That they believe in the Angels, Arch-Angels, Cherubims, and Seraphims, becauſe they were created of God the Father in Eternal Life

Concerning the Virgin *Mary*, he ſaith, That becauſe God alone is to be worſhipped, and that we are not ſure that the Virgin *Mary* hears our Prayers, becauſe ſhe was a humane Creature, and becauſe *Hail Mary* is not a Prayer, but an Annunciation and Salutation, therefore they do not impoſe it for a Penance on thoſe who are of their Sect. And, That the Lord's Prayer is the only true Prayer, as being a Prayer made by God himſelf.

Concerning Purgatory, he ſaith, That there is no ſuch place, but the Clergy, out of Covetouſneſs, have invented it, to extort Money from the People, for Maſſes and Prayers for the Dead, which are of no profit, becauſe as ſoon as a man is dead, he is either ſaved or damned.

Concerning Holy Water, he ſaith, That they do preach, ſay, and believe, that every year, in the Month of *May*, on *Aſcenſion-day*, God bleſſeth the Heaven, Earth, Water, Herbs, Rivers, Fountains, and all Fruits, and that this Bleſſing may be more ſecurely rely'd on, than that which proceeds from the Prieſt, becauſe their Bleſſing is of no force, except they be pure, and free from Sin, and becauſe for the moſt part Prieſts are Sinners, as he ſaid before. For theſe reaſons they have no Faith in the Sacraments adminiſtred by Clergymen.

Saying moreover, That one may as well Pray in a Stable as in the Church, becauſe God is every where.

Concerning Holidays, he ſaith, That ſuch as are appointed by God, as the *Lord's day*, *our Saviour's Nativity*, *Eaſter*, *Aſcenſion*, and *Whitſunday*, are to be kept; but as for the Feaſts of the Bleſſed Virgin, and of the Saints, no man is obliged to obſerve them, except he pleaſe, becauſe they

are

are not injoined by God. Nor is any one bound to faſt upon the Vigils of thoſe Holidays.

Concerning the Body of Chriſt, they ſay, That becauſe the Clergy are wicked, of moſt profligate Lives, and great Sinners, they cannot conſecrate the Body of our Lord, nor is their Conſecration of any vertue. Therefore the *Barbæ* of their Sect do not receive the Euchariſt, but inſtead thereof, they bleſs the Bread, and ſay; That this Bleſſing is of greater vertue and efficacy than the Conſecration of the Prieſts, becauſe as much Goodneſs and Holineſs as a man hath, ſo much Virtue and Power he hath, and no more.

Concerning the Sin of the Fleſh, he ſaith, That as they go up and down the World preaching, they frequent nocturnal Meetings and Aſſemblies, where after that their *Barbæ* have preached, they begin to feaſt and make merry, and dance, running up and down through one another, without holding hands together, and this by Candlelight. That after their Feaſting and Merriment, ſome one of the Company, though it be not known who, puts out the Candle: whereupon they all apply themſelves to act filthineſs with whomſoever they firſt meet with, without any regard had to Father, Mother, Daughter, or any thing elſe. And they ſay, That in caſe in this filthy action any Sons be begotten, that they will be the fitter to diſcharge the Duty and Function of *Barbæ*, and of Preachers and Confeſſors, than others as being begot in their Aſſemblies. This done, every one leaves the Aſſembly.

Saying moreover, That ſuch Aſſemblies as theſe are kept every year in every Pariſh; and that the *Barba*, who is of the Pariſh in which the Meeting is held, is preſent at it, becauſe his Parents are of the ſame. But if he be not of the ſame Pariſh, then he preacheth, and afterwards leaves them to make their Synagogue between them, becauſe he ſhould not mingle with his Parents, neither doth he ſettle himſelf in that Pariſh, except his Parents go away.

The reſt I have not ſet down, as being very frivolous things; as, what he ſaid concerning Swearing, That no body ought to ſwear, and that they never ſwear amongſt themſelves, neither truly nor falſly, as accounting it a mortal Sin.

He ſaith moreover, That no man ought to be put to Death for any fault, how great ſoever it may be, except for Murther.

He ſaith further, That when their *Bar'æ* are created by their Companions, the great Maſter aſſembling the reſt of the *Barbæ* together, as was ſaid before, they then take this Oath, as follows. *Thou* (ſuch an one) *ſwear upon thy Faith to maintain, multiply, and encreaſe our Law, and not to diſcover the ſame to any perſon in the World; and here promiſe that thou wilt not ſwear by God in any manner, but obſerve the Lord's day; and that thou wilt not do any thing to thy Neighbour, which thou wouldſt not have him do to thee; and that thou doſt believe in God, who has made the Sun and Moon, Cherubim and Seraphim, and all that thou ſeeſt*, &c. I have put this whole Interrogatory at the end of this Book.

The other inſtance of the Sincerity of thoſe honeſt Inquiſitors is to be ſeen in the Proceſs of *Peironetta*, a Widow; of which I judged fit to give here this Extract to the Reader.

Peironetta, the Relict of *Peter Berand*, made her appearance before *Anthony Fabri* Doctor of the Canon of *Embrun*, Inquiſitor-General after Hereſie throughout all *Dauphiné*, and the Counties of *Vienne*, *Valence*, and *Die*, ſpecially thereto deputed by the Holy Apoſtolick See; and *Chriſtopher de Sabien*, Doctor of Laws, Canon, Vicar, and Official of *Valence*, at the inſtance and proſecution of the worſhipful *Valetrinus de* , Profeſſor of Laws, Solicitor and Fiſcal of *Valence*, being in this caſe a Promoter, in favour of the Holy Catholick Faith, and of the Deputies of the Office of Inquiſition, againſt *Peironetta*, &c.

To the firſt Interrogatory ſhe anſwered nothing, and therefore I have only ſet down what ſhe anſwered to the ſecond and third Interrogatories.

To

To the ſecond Interrogatory ſhe ſaid and confeſſed, 'That 'about 25 years ago, or thereabouts, there came to the 'Houſe of *Peter Fornerius* her Husband, two Strangers, in 'grey Clothes, who, as it ſeem'd to her, ſpake *Italian*, or 'the Language of *Lombardy*, whom her Husband received 'into his Houſe for the love of God. That whilſt they 'were there at night after Supper, one of them began to 'read a Godly Book, which he carried about with him, 'ſaying, That therein were contained the Goſpels, and 'other Precepts of the Law; and ſaid, That he would 'expound and preach the ſame, in the preſence of all that 'were preſent, ſaying, That he was ſent by God to re-'form the Catholick Faith, going up and down the World, 'like the Apoſtles, to preach to good and ſimple People, 'the manner and way how they ought to worſhip God, 'and live according to his Commands. And that amongſt 'other things they declared, that no body ought to do 'any thing to others, which he would not be willing they 'ſhould do to him.

'Alſo, That God alone is to be ſerved, worſhipped, and 'prayed to, becauſe it is he alone that can help us.

'That to ſwear upon any occaſion whatſoever, whether for 'Truth or Falſhood, or any Oath whatſoever, wherein the 'word *by* is uſed, was a great Sin.

'That the Sacrament of Matrimony was to be faithfully 'and firmly kept.

'That the Good Works which are done before Death, 'are of far greater profit and advantage, than thoſe that are 'done after Death.

'That no Saints whatever, whether Men or Women, were 'to be prayed to for help, becauſe none could aſſiſt us in 'any thing, but God alone.

'That the Lord's day ought to be ſolemnly kept and 'obſerved above all other Holy-days, becauſe all other 'Holy-days were enjoined by the Church, which there-'fore were not of abſolute neceſſity to be obſerved; yea, 'that a man might work on them, except the Feſtivals of 'the Apoſtles, and other greater Saints, which they did not 'particularly expreſs.

'That

'That the Clergy poſſeſſed Money, Riches, and Goods, 'beyond what they ought to do, and that they commit-'ted many Evils, and that by reaſon of the ſuperfluity 'of their Riches, ſome of them were Fornicators, others 'Uſurers, proud and covetous; others again lived diſſo-'lutely and diſhoneſtly, kept Whores in their Houſes pub-'lickly and openly, and by this means gave a bad exam-'ple to the People.

'That theſe Prieſts, by reaſon of their wicked Lives, 'had no greater Power to abſolve, than the Preachers 'and Maſters of that Sect had; yea, that their Maſters and 'Preachers, though Laymen, had as much Power as the 'Prieſts.

'That the Holy Pope, becauſe he did not obſerve the 'Holineſs he ought, had no Power at all, ſaying of him, '*That he was as bad as any of the reſt, and conſequently had no* '*Power at all.*

'That there was no Purgatory in the other World, 'ſaying, *That when any one dies, his Soul immediately goes to Pa-*'*radiſe, if he have lived well and juſtly; but if wickedly, to* '*Hell.*

'That conſequently all Prayers and Interceſſions for the 'Dead were in vain; and that all that the Prieſts did, ſig-'nified nothing, as their ſprinkling Holy Water on the 'Graves, and ſaying, *Kyrie eleiſon, Chriſte eleiſon; Lord have* '*mercy upon us, Chriſt have mercy upon us.*

'That God, in the beginning of the World, bleſſed all 'Waters, and all other things that he had made; and that 'therefore there was no need for the Prieſts to bleſs them a 'ſecond time, which indeed was then no better than other 'Water.

'That the ſaid Prieſts had invented Purgatory, that by 'ſinging and praying for the Dead, they might get ſtore 'of Money to maintain their diſſolute and luxurious Lives.

'That it is better and more meritorious to give Alms to 'the Poor, Sick, and Leprous, than to offer it in the Church 'to the Prieſts, who had too much already.

'That

'That it was as good and equally advantageous to pray 'to God in a House or elsewhere, as in the Church, be- 'cause God is every where.

'That though holy Men and Women were for their 'good Works placed in *Paradise*, yet had they no power 'to assist or help us in any thing, and that therefore they 'ought not to be prayed unto to help us.

'That it was a vain thing to have recourse to the Images 'of the Saints, by praying before them, as having no power 'at all, being only material things, or Pictures made upon 'Walls.

'That for the same reason it was a vain thing to go on 'Pilgrimage to *Rome*, or elsewhere, to pray there before the 'Images of holy Men and Women, as not being able to 'help us.

'That it was not necessary to fast upon the Vigils of any 'Holidays, except those of *Christmas*, *Easter*, and *Whitsuntide*, 'and some other greater Festivals; and that on *Fridays* espe- 'cially they ought to fast.

'That the Preachers, and Masters of their Sect, and the 'Priests, or Clergy-men, were formerly of one and the 'same Order and Degree; but that when the Clergy be- 'gan to follow after Covetousness and the Vanities of this 'World, and their Preachers resolved to continue in their 'first Poverty; by this means a Division and Separation 'happened amongst them, and the Clergy became their 'Enemies. That therefore because the number of their 'Preachers, and others of their Sect, was as yet but very 'small, they were obliged to walk up and down secretly, 'as Christ and his Apostles did, because if the Preachers 'should not walk cautiously and obscurely, they would be in 'danger of being persecuted and ill entreated by others.

It appears, that these Processes were in the year 1494, which Date is found at the beginning of these Examinations.

The foresaid Process or Examination was taken by me Notary, who have subscribed my Name,

GOBAUD.

This

This Extract is faithfully transcribed out of a MS. in the publick Library of *Cambridge*, where it is to be seen in the original. But I thought fit to make it publick at the end of this Work that the Reader may compare those Processes, in which the Inquisitor's Faithfulness is justly to be suspected, since we see that there is very little of the first Sumptum from the mouth of the *Barba*, in the Process that was written afterwards by the Notary of the Inquisitors, according to their pleasure, to expose them to the hatred of all the World.

CHAP. XXVII.

That the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont *have constantly persevered in the same Faith, until the Time of the Reformation.*

THIS is a Confession which Truth hath extorted from *Claudius Seissellus*. The most cruel Persecutions have not been able to abolish the Churches of *Italy*, or to hinder them from a constant defence of that Truth, which they received from their Ancestors, as a Sacred *Depositum*. 'All sorts of People, saith he, have several
Fol. 1. 'times in vain endeavoured to root them out, and yet, 'contrary to the Opinion of all men, they have still 'continued Conquerors, or at least wholly invincible.

It is easie to judge what the Opinions of these Churches were before the Reformation, from what *Seissellus* himself tells us concerning them, before ever they heard of any Reformation.

First,

First, They lay it down as an infallible Maxim, That the Paſtors of the Romiſh Church had loſt all the lawful Authority which they could once have received from God. There were two Cauſes, ſay they, of the Election of *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles; the firſt was, Becauſe Chriſt knew their Faith, and their Charity; the other, That by means of them he might reap much Fruit from the reſt of Mankind: As alſo, that it might appear, That in this Choice there was no reſpect of Perſons, but only regard had to their Piety, and this to that degree, that in caſe they departed from it, they ſhould not only fall from his Grace and Favour, but alſo be deprived of the Authority he had conferr'd upon them. He ſaith elſewhere, *I am the way, the truth, and the life, let him that ſerves me follow me.* And in another place, *I am the vine, ye are the branches; he who abides in me, and I in him, brings forth much fruit: but he who abides not in me, ſhall be cut off and caſt into the fire.* So long then as the Apoſtles continued in Chriſt, (now they alwaies continued from the time that they firſt received the Spirit) the Foundation of the Univerſal Church, has without doubt continued firm and unſhaken, as reſting upon moſt ſtrong Pillars and Baſes; and ſo likewiſe continued under their Succeſſors, as long as they imitated the Actions, Life, Manners, and Faith of the Apoſtles. But as ſoon as theſe Succeſſors began to wander and go aſtray from the Precepts and Doctrine of the Apoſtles, being ſeduced by divers Luſts and Sins, they no doubt departed alſo from Chriſt, and Chriſt from them, and conſequently were cut off from his Myſtical Body; for we cannot call them the Miniſters of Chriſt, who are ſo far from following him, that they follow a quite contrary way. Whence it happens, that from a fruitful Tree they are become the evil and unfruitful Tree, which can bring forth no good Fruit, except it be firſt made good it ſelf; as our Saviour himſelf witneſſeth, ſaying, *The evil Tree cannot bring forth good fruit.* So that the reaſon for which they were choſen ceaſing, the effect of it muſt needs ceaſe alſo. It is evident then

that a wicked man, by his Impiety, is cut off from the Body of Chriſt, as a uſeleſs Branch is cut off from the Vine. Beſides, he who is a Child and Slave of the Devil, cannot have the ſame relation to Chriſt, ſeeing he himſelf ſaith, *No man can ſerve two Maſters*; and elſewhere, *Ye are of your Father the Devil, becauſe ye do his Works.* And beſides, all thoſe who offend God by enormous Crimes, according to the Teſtimony of the Prophet, are blotted out of the Book of Life, and conſequently are rooted out from the Kingdom of Heaven, that is to ſay, the Church.

They maintain. That Believers ought to ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, becauſe She has loſt all her juſt Authority, by the Crimes of her Miniſters, and her Errors in matters of Faith. Our Saviour has warn'd us, ſay they, to beware of this ſort of People; *Beware of falſe Prophets, who come to you in ſheeps cloathing but inwardly are ravening wolves:* And that they might not be at a loſs who thoſe were they were to take heed of, he adds, *You ſhall know them by their fruits.* Now, the Fruits are our Works; if they are evil, we be to be avoided, though we may be cloathed like Sheep.

When things are thus, how can that Biſhop or Prieſt, who is the Enemy of God, have the Power of making God propitious to others? He who himſelf is baniſhed from the Kingdom of Heaven, how can he have the Keys of it? With what power can he conferr Orders? How can he adminiſter the Sacraments in the Virtue of the Spirit, eſpecially conſidering, that the Spirit is ſo far from dwelling in him, that he is an Enemy of the Spirit? Surely the Spirit of God does not dwell in a Body that is a Slave to Sin, but rather abominates both his Actions and Prayers. And if God doth not hear the wicked, in vain do we implore the Suffrages of him, who himſelf hath not God favourable to him. In a word, ſince neither his Prayers, nor his other actions, are of any advantage, how can we ſuppoſe, that at his word Chriſt ſhould transform himſelf under the Species of Bread and Wine, and ſuffer himſelf to be handled by him, whom he hath altogether rejected, and whoſe actions he deteſts and abhorrs?

horrs? Moreover, O immortal God, what wiſe man can ever believe that a King endow'd with the leaſt grain of Wiſdom, will beſtow his Lieutenancy with Soveraign Power upon him to whom he ſcorns to allow a place amongſt the meaneſt of his Servants, him whom he thinks deſerving the very worſt of Puniſhments? Who is the Shepherd that truſts the Wolf with his Sheep? Shall a wiſe man truſt his moſt chaſte Spouſe with a filthy and diſſolute Libertine? Beſides, Is not he who turns himſelf away from God, reduc'd to nothing? The Prophet ſaith, The Wicked in his Preſence comes to nothing; alſo they ſhall be brought to nothing, like Water that fleets away; and in many other places you will find the ſame. He therefore that is nothing, cannot be ſuppoſed to do any thing. And that we might not imagin, that theſe things want Scripture-Teſtimonies to prove them, hear what God himſelf declares; *To what purpoſe is the multitude of your ſacrifices unto me, I am ſated with the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beaſts. I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of the goats.* And then adds, *Bring no more vain oblations, Incenſe is an abomination unto me; the new moons and ſabbaths, the calling of Aſſemblies I cannot away with. Your appointed feaſts my ſoul hateth, they are a trouble to me, I am weary to bear them. When ye ſpread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye multiply your prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.* And *Malachy* ſpeaking of theſe wicked Prieſts, cries out in this manner; *I have no pleaſure in you, ſaith the Lord, neither will I receive any offering at your hands.* And a little lower, *I will curſe your bleſſings.* After this he anſwers a tacite objection; for they might alledge, That God had confirmed the Prieſthood to *Levi*, by an eternal Covenant, and therefore that he could not remove it from their Family. But to this he plainly anſwers, That his Covenant continued firm with the Family of *Levi*, as long as they walked in the ſteps of their Father *Levi*: For after he had ſaid, *My Covenant of life and peace was with him, and I gave him my fear, and he feared me.* He adds, *But ye are departed out of the way; ye have cauſed many to ſtumble at the law; ye*

have broken the covenant of Levi, ſaith the Lord, therefore have I alſo made you contemptible and baſe before all the people, according as ye have not kept my waies, &c. Which words are very applicable to all Biſhops and Prieſts, who tranſgreſs the Ordinances of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; ſeeing he alſo ſpeaks by another Prophet, *I have hated the congregation of evil doers, and will not ſit with the wicked.* And elſewhere, *I hate thoſe that do wickedneſs, and all the workers of Iniquity,* and infinite ſuch like paſſages. Is it not ſaid of *Saul,* after that he had tranſgreſſed the Commandment of the Lord, *that the ſpirit of God departed from him,* though before he had been choſen by God himſelf to govern his People. Moreover, does not Chriſt ſay in the Goſpel, *If any man will come after me, let him deny himſelf, and take up his Croſs and follow me.* And afterwards, *No man can ſerve two Maſters, God and Mammon:* and that which is yet plainer and harder too: *He who doth not forſake all that he hath, cannot be my Diſciple.* Shall we imagine that he will commit his Vicegerency to him whom he will not accept for his Diſciple? Now, if the Popes be ſuch, who will part with nothing that belongs to them, and in other things do not keep the Law of Chriſt, with what Power then do they ordain Biſhops? And thoſe who receive any Orders from them, how can they conferr the ſame upon others, ſince they are all of them ſick of the ſame Diſeaſe? In ſhort, if they conferr no Orders, then thoſe whom they have ordained cannot be true Prieſts, and conſequently neither can they adminiſter any true Sacrament; for if they really had Orders, yet they would defile them by the filthineſs and impurity of their Lives. If therefore we can make it appear, that ſuch are all the Prieſts and Biſhops of the Church of *Rome,* it will be evident, that the Church of God cannot conſiſt of them; for Chriſt cannot be the Head of them who are none of his Members.

Some, it may be, will imagine that theſe Accuſations againſt the Church of *Rome,* and the Corruption of her Paſtors, are extreamly exaggerated.

But

But, first, we have reason to commend the uprightness of *Claudius Seissellius*, in reference to these Criminations, if we further consider what he saith of the *Waldenses* in opposition to the Church of *Rome*. Fol. 14.

'The Pope of *Rome*, and the rest of the Prelates and 'Priests of the Church of *Rome*, do neither follow the Life, 'nor the Precepts of Christ, but do quite the contrary, 'and that no longer secretly, but so openly and mani- 'festly that it can no longer be hid or covered with 'a Vail, because they chiefly value themselves in things 'that are contrary to Religion, and do not only contemn, 'but mock at the Precepts of the Apostles. They lived 'in great Poverty, Humility, Chastity, Continence as to 'carnal things, and contempt of the World: Whereas we 'Prelates and Priests live in great pomp, luxuriousness, 'and dissoluteness; we think it a brave thing to excell 'in Royal Power, rather than Sacerdotal Sanctity; and all 'our endeavours and studies drive only at the acquisition 'of Glory amongst men, not by Virtue Holiness, and 'Learning, but by the abundance and plenty of all things, 'by Arms and warlike Magnificence, and by a vast Ex- 'pence in an Equipage, and furniture of Horses, Gold, and 'other things of that nature. The Apostles would not 'possess any thing as their own, nor would receive any 'into their Society who had not forsaken all, and laid it in 'common: Whereas we not being contented with what we 'have already, fish for other peoples Goods, more avariti- 'ously and impudently than Heathens themselves; there- 'fore it is that we make Wars, and incite Christian Prin- 'ces and People to take up Arms. The Apostles travel- 'ling through Towns and Villages, and sowing the Word 'of God with Power, exercised besides many Offices of 'Charity, according to the several Gifts they had received: 'whereas we do not only do nothing like this, and give 'no good examples of holy Conversation, but besides, we 'frequently resist and oppose those that do opening the 'way to all Dissoluteness and Avarice. They, as it were, 'against their wills, and with reluctancy, by the Command 'or Inspiration of God, received Ordination to promote

'the

'the Salvation of others: whereas we buy Benefices and 'Preferments for Money, or procure them by force, or 'by the favour of Princes, and other indirect means, and 'for no other end, but to satiate our Lusts to enrich 'our Relations, and for the Glory of the World. But 'besides all this, they spent their life in manifold fastings, 'watchings, and labours, being neither affrighted with 'trouble nor with danger, that they might shew to others 'the way to Salvation: whereas we pass our time in idle-'ness, in pleasures, and other earthly or wicked things. 'They despising Gold and Silver, as they had received 'the Divine Grace freely, so they dispensed it to others: 'whereas we set all holy things to sale, and barter with 'the Heavenly Treasures of God himself, and in a word, 'confound all things, both divine and humane. So that 'the Church of *Rome* cannot be said to be the Spouse of 'Christ, but that common prostitute whom *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, '*Ezekiel*, and St. *John* in the *Revelation*, describes in such 'lively colours; for Christ hath joined his Church to him 'to be his Bride, holy, pure, fair, adorned with the Orna-'ments and Jewels of all vertues, without spot or wrin-'kle, such as the Holy Spirit figuratively describes her in the '*Canticles*. Far be it therefore that Christ should ever think 'of changing this his beautiful and lovely Bride, for such a 'stinking loathsome Harlot.

Secondly, We may say, that the case was so plain, that no disguise or excuse was any longer able to palliate the matter.

Fol. 18. 'We don't deny, say the *Waldenses*, according to the ac-'count *Seisselius* gives us, but that God alone is the Searcher 'of Hearts, *who*, as the Scripture saith, *searcheth the heart* '*and trieth the Reins*; and therefore that he alone knows 'whether the Works of men be pleasing unto him, and 'obtain his favour, which others cannot know, save only 'by conjecture. But he himself hath taught us how we may 'know it, saying, *You shall know them by their fruits; for an* '*evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit, nor a good tree evil fruit.* 'Wherefore though it be a difficult thing to judge of good 'Works, because they receive their value from the Intention

'of

'of the Doer, yet wicked works diſcover themſelves, and
'the intention cannot make them good, eſpecially when
'they are evidently repugnant to the Law of God, and open
'and bareſac'd. And therefore, if I ſee the Biſhops and
'Prieſts every day living in Diſſoluteneſs and Luxury,
'robbing others of their Goods, ſmiting their Neighbors,
'perſecuting thoſe that are good, blaſpheming the Name of
'God, prodigally waſting the Patrimony of the Church in
'Voluptuouſneſs and damnable Crimes, may not I un-
'doubtedly affirm, that they who commit theſe things are
'not the Miniſters of God, but his publick and avowed Ene-
'mies? Surely ſuch they are, though we ſhould ſuppoſe
'created or confirmed by an univerſal Synod of Chriſtians,
'or by the Pope, or by *Peter* himſelf. But how much
'more may we conclude them ſuch, when thoſe who or-
'dain them are worſe than they themſelves, and their
'Works openly worſe than theirs? What ſhall we ſay,
'if it appears, that they have publickly and notoriouſly
'bought the Papacy, that they openly ſet to ſale ſacerdotal
'Functions, and that they ſet over the Churches, not by mi-
'ſtake, but out of malice, thoſe who are known to be wholly
'unworthy of that Charge; and when ever in all their
'life time did any thing worthy not only of a Prieſt, but ſo
'much as of a Chriſtian? Shall we obey ſuch Prieſts and
'Prelates, who lead us the way to Salvation neither by
'Word nor Work, but rather endeavour all they can to
'drag us into the ſame Pit of Deſtruction after them?
'Doth not our Saviour tell us, that we muſt not ſuffer
'our ſelves to be led by blind Guides, leſt when one
'blind man leads another, they both fall into the Ditch?
'Hath not he declared, that ſuch as theſe are cut off from
'the Life of the Church and the Body of Chriſt, and deſti-
'ned to the Fire? How can he be the Vicegerent of Chriſt,
'who is not ſo much as a Chriſtian, or a Member of the My-
'ſtical Body of Chriſt, whom he commands us to avoid as
'a Heathen and Publican, as long as he continues incorrigible.
'And the Apoſtolical Authority, the Faith of *Peter*, which Fol. 38.
'Chriſt ſaith ſhould not fail the Catholick Church, with
'whom he promiſeth to abide for ever, is to be found amongſt

'us,

'us, who imitate the Life of the Apoſtles, who accor-
'ding to our weakneſs, obſerve their Commands and
'Ordinances. We are thoſe very Perſons of whom
'St. *Paul* ſpeaks in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; *Brethren,*
'*conſider your calling, that you are not many wiſe men after the*
'*fleſh, not many mighty, nor many noble; but God hath choſen the*
'*fooliſh things of this world, to confound the wiſe; and the weak*
'*things of this world, to confound the things that are mighty; and*
'*the baſe and deſpiſed things of this world, yea, the things that*
'*are not, to bring to nought the things that are.* And St. *Paul*
'himſelf tells us, that he was ſent to preach the Goſpel
'not in the mightineſs of Man's wiſdom, but in ſimplicity
'and plainneſs; alledging to this purpoſe what the Lord
'ſaith elſewhere; *I will deſtroy the wiſdom of the wiſe, and will*
'*bring to nought the prudence of the prudent.*

Without doubt the Biſhop of *Meaux* will tell us, That all this is nothing elſe but the overflowing of a Schiſmatical Temper, exaſperated by the corruption of the Clergy and their licentiouſneſs; but that indeed there is nothing in all this, that ſhews them to have held the ſame Principles with thoſe of the Reformation. I ſhall then make it my buſineſs to evidence the contrary, and that after ſo clear and viſible a manner, that the Biſhop ſhall no longer be in a condition to diſguiſe it. What *Seiſſelius* tells us in particular, concerning the Articles of their Faith, is this:

Fol. 4. 'They receive only, ſaith he, what is written in the Old
'and New Teſtament.

'They ſay, That the Popes of *Rome*, and other Prieſts, have
'depraved the Scriptures by their Doctrines and Gloſſes.

'They ſay, That they owe neither Tithes nor Firſt-fruits
'to the Clergy.

'They ſay, That the Conſecrations of Churches, Indul-
'gences and other ſuch-like Benedictions, are the Inventions
'of falſe Prieſts.

'They do not celebrate the Feſtivals of the Saints.

'They ſay, That Men do not ſtand in need of the Suf-
'frages of the Saints. Chriſt abundantly ſufficing in all
'things.

'They

'They affirm, That Marriage may be contracted in any 'degree, excepting only one or two at the most; as if the 'Popes had no Power to prohibit Marriage in any other 'degrees.

'They say, That whatever is done to deliver the Souls of 'the Dead from the Pains of Purgatory, is useless lost, and 'superstitious.

'They say, that our Priests have no power of forgiving sins.

'They say, That they alone observe the Evangelical and 'Apostolical Doctrine, and upon this account, by an intole-'rable impudence, they usurp the Name of the Catholick 'Church.

Their *Barbæ*, saith *Seisselius*, do err greatly, because they are neither sent of God, nor by the Pastors of the Church, but of the Devil; as appears from their Damnable Doctrine.

'They say, That the Authority of hearing Confessions 'belongs to all Christians that walk according to the Apo-'stle's Precepts (which their *Barbæ* attribute to themselves) 'because St. *James* saith, *Confess your sins one to another.*

'They say, That we ought not to admit any kind of Prayer 'except it appear that it was composed by some certain Au-'thor, and approved of God, in order to obtain something of 'him. Their *Barbæ* have often preached this Doctrine, to 'abolish the Service of the glorious Virgin, and of other Saints.

'They do not think that Christians ought to say the An-'gelical Salutation to the Mother of God, alledging, That it 'has not the form of a Prayer, but a Salutation: But it is 'only that they might rob the Virgin of this Service, say-'ing, That it is not lawful to worship or serve her any more 'than the rest of the Saints.

'They affirm, That the Blessings of the Priests are of no 'virtue at all. Did not Christ bless the Bread in the Desart? 'When the Apostles sate down to eat Bread, they blessed 'what was set upon the Table. Fol. 55.

'They say, There is no need of Holy Water in the 'Churches, because neither Christ himself nor his Apostles 'either made it, or commanded it: As if we ought to say 'or do nothing but what we read was done by them.

'They ſay, That the Indulgences allowed of by the 'Church are deſpicable uſeleſs things.

'They ſay, That the Souls of the Dead, without being 'tried by any Purgation, do immediately upon their par-'ting from the Body, enter into Joy or Pains, and that the 'Clergy, blinded by their Covetouſneſs, have invented Pur-'gatory.

'They ſay, That the Saints cannot take notice of what 'is done here below.

'They abhor and deteſt all Images, and the ſign of the 'Croſs, much more than we honour them.

'They make no diſtinction between the Worſhip of *La-'tria*, which is due to God only, and that of *Dulia*, which 'belongs to the Saints.

'As to the Faſts, which the Catholick Church has inſti-'tuted for the Honour of God and the Saints, they have 'yet leſs reaſon to object theſe to us.

There is a pleaſant Error *Seiſſelius* aſcribes to them, about the nature of Lying, which evidenceth how great their Purity was as to this Article, and with what impudence it is that their Enemies calumniate them with Equivocation. 'They affirm, That a Lye is alwaies a mortal Sin, becauſe '*David* ſays, *God deſtroys all lyars*. But it is evident that theſe general Propoſitions are to be moderated, otherwiſe who ſhould be ſaved? Hereupon to convince them in an Error, he accuſeth all the Saints, even St. *Paul* and Chriſt himſelf, to have made uſe of Lies upon occaſion.

But becauſe in all this we have made no mention of Tranſubſtantiation, the Biſhop of *Meaux* will take it for granted, that in *Seiſſelius*'s time, the *Waldenſes* received it as a Doctrine of Faith; but he will miſtake himſelf if he do, for *Seiſſelius* declares that they rejected it to be a great Extravagance. He tells us alſo, 'That they made a mock 'of all the Artifices they made uſe of, to make it appear 'more plauſible to them. I think, ſaith he, that thoſe took 'pains to little purpoſe, who writing againſt this Sect, made 'it their chief buſineſs to inſiſt upon the difficulties about 'the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and in order to the clearing 'of them, have ſpoken ſo ſharply and ſubtilly, that I may not

'ſay

'ſay confuſedly, that I have great reaſon to doubt whether 'ever they underſtood the thing themſelves. Yet I will not 'ſay, that becauſe I do not comprehend it my ſelf (for that 'I ingenuouſly confeſs) I think it alſo to ſurpaſs the capacity 'of others; but becauſe it has alwaies appeared to me to be 'a point of that difficulty, that the moſt able have been fain 'to profeſs, That the ſtrength of Humane Underſtanding 'muſt in this caſe be ſubject to Faith: after which he uſeth his utmoſt endeavours to perſwade the *Waldenſes* to embrace an Opinion, for the which they had alwaies teſtified a great averſion.

By this we may ſee what was the Faith of the Believers of *Piedmont*, as far as *Seiſſelius*'s account thereof reacheth. And as for their Carriage and Converſation, the ſame *Seiſſelius* tells us; 'They ſay, that they deſire only to overcome 'by the ſimplicity of Faith, Purity, of Conſcience, and 'Integrity of Life; not by Philoſophical Niceties, and 'Theological Subtilties.

'Setting aſide what they hold in oppoſition to our Faith 'and Religion, for the reſt, ſaith that Biſhop, they for the 'moſt part lead a more pure life than other Chriſtians. They 'Swear not at all, except they be forced to it, and very rarely 'take the Name of God in vain: They honeſtly perform 'their Promiſes; and the moſt part of them living in pover-'ty, they proteſt that they alone obſerve the Life and Do-'ctrine of the Apoſtles, and therefore affirm, That the 'Power of the Church reſides in them, as the true innocent 'Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt, for the ſake of whoſe Faith and 'Religion they live in Poverty.

'Tis impoſſible to give them a more advantagious Teſti-mony than what he gives them elſewhere, acknowledging, That they look'd upon it as an honourable and glorious thing to ſuffer the Perſecutions which were raiſed againſt them by the Church of *Rome*.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Containing the Concluſion of this Treatiſe.

THESE are the Obſervations I thought my ſelf oblig'd to make, upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the ancient Churches of the Valleys of *Piedmont* to evidence their Apoſtolical Succeſſion. If in this undertaking I have not been able to clear ſome points, the fault thereof is to be charg'd on thoſe who have perſecuted them to the higheſt degree of Outrage and Cruelty, and who have ſpared none of their Monuments of Antiquity, but ſuch as they thought might ſome way or other make theſe Believers odious and abominable to thoſe of the Romiſh Communion. However, I hope that an equal Reader will meet with ſome ſatisfaction from theſe my Endeavours, and will eaſily conclude from theſe Remarks, that the cauſe of that implacable Hatred of the Pope and his Clergy, againſt the Churches of *Piedmont*, was nothing elſe but the deſign of extirpating a race of People, whoſe zeal for the Purity of the Goſpel engaged them to upbraid the Church of *Rome* with her Corruptions in matters of Faith, her Idolatry, her falſe and ſuperſtitious Worſhip, and her horrid Tyranny.

And foraſmuch as my deſign is not to abuſe my Reader, I neither pretend to excuſe all the Errors, which ſome of the Members of theſe Churches may have held, nor indeed to juſtifie them altogether, in all the Articles, which might have been objected againſt them, during the time of almoſt 600 years, wherein the Romiſh Party has oppoſed them. I am perſwaded, that all good men will have that Equity and Kindneſs for theſe Churches, which the Doctors of the Romiſh Church do ſo dexterouſly make uſe of themſelves, upon occaſion of any Indictments formed againſt the Primitive Church, in thoſe times that were neareſt to the Apoſtles, by thoſe that have attacked them; or when the queſtion is concerning Errors found in the Writings of the moſt ancient

Doctors

Doctors or Fathers of the Church. Should any do otherwiſe, they would declare themſelves thereby to be in oppoſition to natural Equity and the Principles of Charity, eſpecially ſince after all it cannot be denied, but that the Body of theſe Churches have alwaies preſerved amongſt them whatſoever is neceſſary to the Conſtitution of a true Society of *Chriſtians*.

The Church of *Rome* her ſelf furniſheth us with an excuſe for ſome of the Errors they had in common with the Chriſtians of old, when ſhe owns, that for all them they did not ceaſe to be true Churches. Some of theſe Errors are ſuch, as that they of the Church of *Rome* are ready to apologize for theſe Churches in that behalf; and there be others again, wherein tho' they have not the approbation of many Proteſtant Churches, yet can they defend themſelves with their agreeing therein with other Chriſtian Communions, whom the Proteſtants own for true Members of the Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

I cannot but repreſent to the Reader the particular character, which the Author of the Noble Leſſon has given us of theſe Churches, *viz.* their Conſtancy in ſuffering the Perſecution of the Church of *Rome*, and indeed this is their true character, in a moſt eminent and illuſtrious degree, for ſcarcely is there a Church to be found in the world, that ever had the advantage of having born the Croſs of Chriſt, as the Church of the Valleys of *Piedmont* have done. Never did the Church of *Rome* give in a more inconteſtable evidence of her own Antichriſtianiſm, than by her inſatiable Thirſt after the Blood of thoſe Chriſtians, who renounced her Communion theſe Six hundred years laſt paſt, for to allay which, ſhe has made the Blood of theſe poor Innocents to run down every where like Rivers, exterminating by Fire and Sword thoſe who were not moved by the empty noiſe of her *Anathema*'s: So that for ſo great an interval of time the *Waldenſes* have alwaies been in the condition of Sheep led to the ſlaughter, by their continual and uninterrupted Martyrdom maintaining and adorning the Religion of our Saviour, which the Church of *Rome* did no longer profeſs, but in mode and way adapted to her corrupt

rupt worldly Intereſts, and to the deſign ſhe had of making it a *ſtalking horſe* to the Pomp, Lordlineſs, and Tyranny of her Pope and Clergy.

Whatſoever Reflections they of the Church of *Rome* may paſs upon God's ſeeming to have abandoned theſe poor and helpleſs Churches to the Rage and Fury of their *Cannibal* Party, I am fully perſwaded, that they who have never ſo little made it their ſtudy, to conſider the conduct of Providence towards the Primitive Church, will not at all be offended at this ſeeming deſertion of the *Waldenſes*, and abandoning of them to the outrageous Cruelty of their Perſecutors, nor look upon the ſeeming Triumphs of the Apoſtate Church, as a mark of the weakneſs of the Truth profeſſed by theſe People. And indeed, notwithſtanding the extream rigour of their Perſecutions, we find, that God hath tenderly preſerved them until the Reformation, and though he has often expos'd them to the Rage and Barbarous uſage of their Perſecutors, yet withal has from time to time ſent them ſuch Deliverances, which have continued them until this day: theſe their Perſecutions, like thoſe of the Apoſtles, having only ſerved to procure Martyrs to the glorious truth of the Goſpel, and to diſperſe throughout all places the knowledge and good ſavour thereof, which the Romiſh Party treading in the ſteps of the ancient Synagogue, did ſo cruelly perſecute.

Without doubt this was the Reflection *Luther* made upon this account, when he was ſo far from being offended at the Rumour his Adverſaries had ſpread concerning him, that by means of the cloſe purſuit of *Leo* X, he had no place left to hide his Head, ſave amongſt the Picars, who were a Colony of the *Waldenſes*, ſettled in *Bohemia*, he openly declared, that he was not in the leaſt troubled at this their Report; for after he had more exactly informed himſelf of their Belief, and having ſearch'd into the deſign and intent of thoſe black Calumnies charg'd upon them, he own'd them for his Brethren, and commended them for faithful Chriſtians: And though at that time he did not agree with them in all things, as being not himſelf

ſelf wholly freed from the Impurities of the Church of *Rome*, yet he writes to them with ſuch an affection and eſteem, as abundantly ſhews the reſpect he had for thoſe who for ſo long a time had oppoſed the Corruptions of the Truth.

It was upon the ſame account that *Conrad Pellican*, one of the moſt learned men that had a hand in the Reformation, undertook in the year 1543. at *Zurich*, publickly to read the Works of the *Waldenſes*, that is to ſay, thoſe Pieces which ſince have been publiſhed by the Author of *Faſciculus rerum Expetendarum*, and by *Lydius*, which contain their Apologies preſented to King *Vadiſlas*. By this means he gave to his Auditors an occaſion and ſure means to refute the ridiculous cavillings of the Papiſts, who were very deſirous, as they are ſtill, to fix the *Epocha* of the Reformation to the year 1517, in pointing out to them a whole Body of a Church, which in ſpight of all the oppoſition of the Romiſh Party, had alwaies maintained the Truth, and preſerved it in a ſufficient degree of Purity, whilſt the Church of *Rome* made uſe of her utmoſt endeavours to corrupt it, to ſerve her own baſe Deſigns.

The Learned and Famous *Uſher* followed the ſteps of theſe great men, in his undertaking to juſtifie the *Waldenſes*, and to make out their Succeſſion, with ſo many marks of exactneſs and diligence, and in having prompted thoſe that have converſed with him, and who have inherited of his Light and Spirit, earneſtly to deſire that the Hiſtory of theſe Churches might be more and more cleared.

Let the Biſhop of *Meaux* then, if he pleaſe, think the Proteſtants might be aſham'd to go and look for their Anceſtors among the *Waldenſes*, and to hunt for them in the Caverns of the *Alps*. His Declamations ſhall never be able to make us forego a jot of that tender veneration and reſpect we have moſt juſtly conceiv'd for this Nurſery, and Seed-plot of Martyrs, and for thoſe triumphant Troops, who have ſo generouſly laviſh'd away their Blood in the defence of Truth, againſt all the efforts, all the machinations, and all the Violences of the Romiſh Party. The

Judgment

Judgment of St. *Hilarius*, expreſt in his Writing againſt *Auxentius*, may be ſufficient to arm us againſt all the Cavils of thoſe who will needs have, that it was impoſſible that ever their Church ſhould loſe its Purity, or that the ſame ſhould be preſerved by theſe Churches, reduced to Caverns and Mountains. *Unum moneo, cavete Antichriſtum. Male enim vos parietum amor cœpit, male Eccleſiam Dei in tectis ædificiiſque veneramini: male ſub his pacem ingeritis. Anne ambiguum eſt in his Antichriſtum ſeſſurum? Montes mihi & ſylvæ & lacus & carceres & voragines ſunt tutiores; in his enim Prophetæ aut manentes, aut demerſi Dei ſpiritu prophetabant.* P. 316. *Oper. Hilarii.* 'One thing I muſt warn you of, Beware of Antichriſt. 'Tis ill done of you to fall in love with Walls; 'tis ill done 'of you to reverence the Church of God in Buildings and 'Edifices; you do ill to reſt in theſe things. Or, Can you 'queſtion, that it is on theſe Antichriſt will fix his Throne? 'Give me Mountains, Foreſts, Pits, and Priſons, as being 'far the ſafer places; for in theſe it was hat the Prophets 'propheſied from the Spirit of G O D.

Scriptum

Scriptum Inquisitoris cujuspiam Anonymi de Valdensibus, ex Codice MS. G. in Publica Bibliotheca Cantabrig.

UT vobis Reverendissimo in Christo Patri & Domino, Domino Rostagno Ebredunensi Archiepiscopo, Vobisque Reverendis Patribus & Dominis fratri Laurentio Cistaricensi Episcopo, & Thomæ Paschalis Orlianensi Officiali, Commissariis Apostolicis, Regia & Dalphinali auctoritate suffultis ad causam eorum pauperum de Lugduno quos vulgus Valdenses appellat, dictos *à Valdeo cive Lugdunensi*, in loco dicto vulgariter *Val grant* moram faciente, Qui homo dives Hæresiarcha, primus hæresis sectæ Valdensium Inventor fuit, secundum Scripturam, *Qui bonis temporalibus renuncians*, cœpit cum suis complicibus vitam Apostolicam cum Cruce & paupertate ducere. Et experrectis viris Ecclesiasticis, multos sibi discipulos sociavit, qui inde dicti sunt pauperes de Lugduno, qui dicentes vivere sub obedientia Apostolica, ab illa tamen se separantes pertinaciter respondebant cum redarguerentur, *magis esse Deo obediendum quam hominibus*: fuerunt tandem & merito per *mili autem Ecclesiam damnati, sed non radicitus extirpati, quia Lugduno fugientes ad ultimas Dalphinatus partes, se transferentes in Ebredunensi & Taurinensi diœcesibus in Alpibus & intra concava montium accessu difficilia, plures ibi ex ipsis habitaverunt*, ubi paulatim procurante satore *Zizania*, in copioso numero excreverunt, & demum Palmites suos tristes in Liguriam, Italiam & ultra Romam in Apuliam transmiserunt: & quemadmodum Christus Redemptor noster discipulos suos binos mittebat ad prædicandum; sic & Idiota & bestialis illius sectæ Magnificius alios Magistros inferiores per ipsum creatos & probatos, quos vulgo *Barbas* dicimus, ad do-

cendum & prædicandum hujuſmodi ſectæ doctrinam, hinc inde *binos mittere ſolitus* fuit, hi ſiquidem Barbæ creari ſolent per eorum ſupremum in civitate *Ac nilæ* in Regno Neapolitano, & in eorum creatione quædam ſolet fieri ſolennitas. Nam *in deriſum Romani Pontificis*, eis nomina mutantur cum ad magiſterium hujuſmodi afficiuntur, cujus ſiquidem damnatiſſimæ hæreſis cultores quibus viri & mulieres vallis Cluſionis Taurinenſis diœceſis & omnes mares & fœminæ vallis Frayxineriæ, ac plures vallium Argenteriæ & Loyſiæ Ebredunenſis diœceſis à tanto tempore *quod non eſt memoria hominum*, in contrarium fuerunt proni pluſquam centum numero ex ipſis ſponte confeſſi fuerunt, ſequentes articulos contra fidem noſtram, tenuerunt tenentque & immobiliter obſervant. Et ut de eo conſtet & liquidius appareat, Procurator fidei juncto Procuratore Patriæ & locorum circumvicinorum patriæ Briantenenſis & Ebredunenſis pro manutentione fidei Chriſtianæ & honoris patriæ relevatione contra omnes & ſingulos dictæ vallis Frayxineriæ, dat & facit ſequentes titulos quos petit admitti ad probandum, citra tamen onus ſuperfluæ probationis ad quod ſe aſtringere non intendit, de quo & de expenſis contra eos omnes & ſingulos ſolemniter proteſtatur.

In primis ponit & dicit ac probare intendit, quod ipſi homines vallis Frayxineriæ fuerunt *à centum annis citra ultra*, ac per tempora ipſa & alia à tanto tempore cujus *initii memoria hominum non exiſtit*, fuerunt & de præſenti ſunt hæretici, & ſequentes articulos contra catholicam fidem tenuerint & tenent; & hoc eſt verum, notorium, publicum & manifeſtum.

Item & quod fuerunt & de præſenti ſunt pro hæreticis & Valdenſibus habiti, tenti & reputati communiter, & ab omnibus de eiſdem & eorum vita, moribus & converſatione notitiam habentibus; & hoc fuit & eſt verum, notorium, publicum & manifeſtum.

Item & quod de præmiſſis fuit & eſt publica vox & fama, nedum apud circumvicinos, imo & apud omnes à centum leucis & ultra diſtantes à dicta valle; & hoc fuit & eſt verum, notorium, publicum & manifeſtum.

Item

Item & quod fuerunt & de præſenti ſunt ubique terrarum de hæreſi & damnatiſſima Valdenſium ſecta fidei Chriſtianæ contraria diffamati; & hoc fuit & eſt verum, notorium & manifeſtum.

Item & quod propterea homines locorum circumvicinorum, licet catholici & Chriſtiani ac Chriſti fideles ex ipſorum de Frayxineria labe ubique terrarum dehoneſtantur & improperia quamplurima . . . . atque damna & intereſſe, quia ab honoribus multis commodis rejiciuntur ex ſuſpicione ipſorum de Frayxineria; & hoc fuit & eſt verum, notorium, publicum & manifeſtum.

Item & quod dicti de Frayxineria hæretici dicuntur, & viſi ſunt mali & obſtinati & fidei catholicæ contrarii, iniqui ac perverſi, ac pro talibus habiti, tenti & reputati, articulos ſequentes contra fidem Chriſti tenentes; & hoc eſt verum, notorium, publicum & manifeſtum.

Item & pro eo, quia Eccleſiam Romanam dicunt Eccleſiam malignantium, & eam diffamant & reprobant, & ita credunt damnabiliter & contra fidem catholicam; & hoc eſt verum, notorium, publicum & manifeſtum.

Item & pro eo, quia credunt & crediderunt quod in ipſis tantum ſit Eccleſia Dei qui vivunt in paupertate, in *eorum ſymbolo* credentes in ſanctam Eccleſiam ſine macula & ruga conſtitutam; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia damnabiliter credunt & crediderunt quod eorum Magiſtri & Barbæ poteſtatem habeant ligandi & ſolvendi, & quod illis & non Presbyteris Romanæ Eccleſiæ confitenda ſunt peccata; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod non licuit nec licet Prælatos Romanæ Eccleſiæ habere *patrimonium* aut Juriſdictionem temporalem in hoc ſeculo, & quod à Beato Silveſtro non fuit verus Papa; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod quantam quis habet ſanctitatem, tantam habet facultatem & poteſtatem in Eccleſia, & non ultra; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod Sacramenta per Presbyteros Romanæ Eccleſiæ miniſtrata nullius ſint efficaciæ ſeu virtutis; contra fidem noſtram, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod eiſdem Presbyteris Romanæ Eccleſiæ *non ſunt ſolvenda decima*, neque eis ſunt dandæ oblationes, propter præmiſſa; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod de Cenſuris & pœnis per Prælatos Romanæ Eccleſiæ inflictis curandum non eſt, quoniam non arctant neque ligant propter defectum ſanctitatis, quia non ſervant veſtigia Chriſti, contra fidem & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod Romana Eccleſia eſt *Domus confuſionis, Babylon, Meretrix, & Synagoga Diaboli*; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod eidem Romanæ Eccleſiæ, ſeu Prælatis eiſdem non eſt obediendum; & quod omnes eis obedientes ſunt damnati; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod *nullum eſt Purgatorium* in alio ſeculo, ſed tantum purgantur viventes in præſenti, & quod dum quis moritur, ſtatim avolat ad Paradiſum, vel labitur in Infernum, aſſeverantes Eccleſiam Romanam cupiditate ductam, Purgatorium inveniſſe, & quod pro mortuis ideo non eſt orandum; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod pro quacunque re vera vel falſa non licet jurare; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod licitum eſt libidinoſe convenire, & participare etiam cum omni perſona ſibi in quovis conſanguinitatis vel affinitatis gradu conjuncta, ſaltem quando conveniunt cum aliis ejuſdem ſectæ in eorum prædicationibus, & extinctis luminibus; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod tantum prodeſt Deum orare in ſtabulo, quantum in Eccleſia; contra fidem, & hoc eſt verum.

Item

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod *solus Deus orandus est*, non autem Virgo Maria, non Sancti & Sanctæ, quia cum sint à nobis remoti non possunt audire preces nostras; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod aquæ pluviales sunt ejusdem virtutis sicut sunt *aquæ benedictæ* in Ecclesia, quia omnes aquæ fuerunt à Deo benedictæ; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod etiam *Dominis temporalibus non est obediendum*, nisi sint de eorum Secta; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item quod pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod detegere aliquem de dicta secta est peccatum irremissibile, contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod extra eorum sectam nemo salvatur, & qui sunt de eorum secta sancti esse dicuntur; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod de *festivitatibus Sanctorum & Sanctarum* per Romanam Ecclesiam introductis non est curandum, quod licitum est omni die opus servile exercere; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt quod ubicunque licet & permissum est *vesci carnibus* & quocunque tempore anni, & quod Jejunia per Ecclesiam Romanam introducta non sunt servanda, eorum quadragesimam incipiendo secunda feria post primam Dominicam quadragesimæ; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod non *licet hæreticis eorum secta* cum catholicis matrimonia contrahere, & multa alia erronea & nefaria tenuerunt, crediderunt & prædicaverunt, prout confessi fuerunt, & contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & quod propterea Reverendissimi dudum Pontifices & Prælati Ebredunenses cum Inquisitoribus hæreticæ pravitatis retroactis temporibus, magnos assumpserunt labores ut hæreticam ipsam sectam à partibus illis avellerent, usque ad tempora Rev^mi in Christo Patris & Domini Domini Joannis Archiepiscopi Ebredunensis novissime vita functi, & hoc est verum.

Item

Item & quod Præfatus quondam Reverendiſſimus Dominus Joannnes Ebredunenſis Archiepiſcopus ſtatim poſt ejus aſſumptionem & de An. Dom. milleſimo quadringenteſimo ſexageſimo primo, ne ſanguis eorum de ſuis manibus exquireretur, ad corrigendos illorum exceſſus, & ad extirpandam illam hæreticam ſectam per monitiones, exhortationes & commendationes cœpit diligenter inſurgere, ſed intervenientibus impedimentis, non potuit ad finem perducere; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod propterea, de Anno Domini milleſimo quadrigenteſimo ſeptuageſimo tertio, Frater Joannes Veylleti Ordinis Minorum, ſacræ Theologiæ Doctor, & Inquiſitor authoritate Apoſtolica deputatus contra ipſos de Vallibus Frayxineriæ, Argenteriæ & Vallis Loyſiæ proceſſus formavit, ex quibus detecta eſt dicta hæretica ſecta, qua pro inſertis articulis ſponte confeſſi ſunt credidiſſe; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod ſucceſſive præfatus quondã Reverendiſſimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiſcopus de Anno Domini milleſimo quadringenteſimo octuageſimo tertio cum viris catholicis & aliis eorum complicibus uſque ad numerum Nonaginta *novas informationes ſumpſit*, ex quibus apparet quod omnes illi de Frayxineria & multi de valle Loyſia & Argenteria diffamatiſſimi & ſuſpectiſſimi de dicta hæretica ſecta apud omnes habebantur; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod propterea præfatus Reverendiſſimus quondam Dominus Joannes Archiepiſcopus, & de Anno milleſimo quadringenteſimo octuageſimo ſexto & diebus decima octava & vigeſima nona Junii, & tertiò die nona Julii ejuſdem anni eos generaliter moneri fecit infra terminum in litteris contentum & per litteras patentes debite executas quibus parere neglexerunt; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod propterea & ſucceſſive & de menſe Auguſti præfatus quondam Reverendiſſimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiſcopus mandavit eos omnes nominatim ſuſpectos citari reſponſuros de fide, offerendo illis gratiam ſi redire vellent ad gremium Eccleſiæ, qui contumaciter comparere neglexerunt; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod ſucceſſive de Anno prædicto & die decima quinta Septembris præfatus quondam Reverendiſſimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiſcopus litteras patentes laxavit & excommunicatorias in eorum perfidiam & obſtinatam contumaciam executas die decima ſeptima ejuſdem Septembris, & quam excommunicationem ſuſtinuerunt uſque ad diem ſextam menſis Februarii Anni Domini milleſimi quadringenteſimi octuageſimi ſeptimi, & à longe ultra in excommunicatione ſorduerunt. Inter quos nominatus fuit Angellinus Palloni, qui tanto opere nunc ad veritatem occultandam ſuis mendaciis elaborat; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & ſucceſſive Reverendiſſimus Pater Dominus Albertus de Cappitaneis Archidiaconus Cremonenſis in utraque facultate non mediocriter peritus, authoritate Apoſtolica deputatus contra eoſdem proceſſit & informationes ſumpſit, & de Ann. milleſimo quadringenteſ. octuageſ. octavo & die ſexta Februarii, & ſe informavit cum quatuor ex complicibus eorum concludentibus in effectu cum aliis per præfatum Reverendiſſimum quondam Dominum Joannem Archiepiſcopum ſuper his examinatis, ex quo formatis proceſſibus certis motus reſpectibus à ſede Apoſtolica obtinuit procedere *non vocato Ordinario*, & tandem nominatim citari mandavit eoſdem reſponſuros de fide, eiſdem benigne oblata gratia, ſi redire vellent ad Eccleſiæ unitatem. Quibus citationibus ipſi obſtinati hæretici comparere contempſerunt; ex quo undecima Februarii ſucceſſive pro ſecunda vice citati per literas debite executas, iterum contumaciter comparere neglexerunt. Et ideo contra eoſdem & merito literas excommunicatorias laxavit debite executas & publicatas, ſed excommunicationem ipſam & aggravationem ſemper magis eorum perfidia ſuſtinuerunt, ex quo per literas patentes citati fuerunt viſuri loca ad quæ ipſis declinare contingebat ſupponi eccleſiaſtico interdicto, qui pariter comparere poſtpoſuerunt; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod ſucceſſive præfatus Dominus commiſſarius ſæpius miſit ad eos plures viros Deum timentes & ſalutem animarum hæreticorum illorum quærentes, ut eos ad viam lucis & gratiæ reducerent, ſed illos tanquam obſtinatos

natos ad postulandum veniam nullo modo flectere potuerunt ; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod successive ac propterea antefactus Dominus Commissarius eos nominatim citari mandavit, ut coram eo comparerent audituri definitivam sententiam per ipsum ferendam per literas debite executas die secunda Martii Anno supradicto , qui contumaciter semper magis comparere neglexerunt, & ideo nemine comparente, præfatus Dominus Commissarius cernens cor eorum induratum esse, nec in eis signa aliqua pœnitentiæ apparere, cum peritorum consilio , visis omnibus præcedentibus, ad suam definitivam processit sententiam per quam eos ut hæreticos pertinaces & rebelles brachio seculari reliquit ; & hoc est verum.

Item quod propterea ex commissione extremi Parliamenti Dalphinalis pro brachio seculari implorati, strenuus Miles Dominus Hugo de Palude Comes de Varax Locumtenens Dalphini, & Magnificus Jurium doctor, & Dalphini Consiliarius Dominus Joannes Rabboti, servatis de jure servandis, processerunt contra eosdem qui proprias relinquentes domos cavernas & latibula montium ac rupturas rupum sibi pro fortalicio elegerunt : sed interim dicti Domini Commissarii Apostolicus & Dalphinales iterum eis gratiam & Ecclesiæ Gremium obtulerunt ; proviso quod puro corde & fide non ficta redirent. Ipsi vero tunc quasi omnes de rupibus sponte non ligati, non quæstionati descendentes qui voluerunt venire mares & fœminæ ad gratiam benigne recepti fuerunt per eundem Commissarium Apostolicum, & confessi fuerunt gratis & sine metu torturæ se fuisse & esse Valdenses, seu pauperes de Lugduno, & illorum hæresim seu sectam tenuisse, ac illi & illius articulis supra descriptis credidisse, & inter cereros *Angellinus Palloni* qui materiam prosequitur ad præsens, ac testante processu præsenti justificando in forma probante ; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod reliqui, duodecim vel quindecim numero, in eorum turma existentes, qui contenti gratia & venia, Diabolico Spiritu imbuti ab aliis aufugerant cum essent plus obstinati, baniti fuerunt ; & hoc est verum, notorium & manifestum.

Item

Item & quod alii ad gratiam admiſſi de ſe ſponte confeſſi, dictam damnatiſſimam Valdenſium Sectam & Hæreticam pravitatem ſupra declaratam abjuraverunt & quamcunque aliam ſolenniter poſt prædicationem, & in eorum abjurationibus expreſſe promiſerunt inter alia nuſquam receptare ſeu occultare prædictos banitos, ſed illos dum venirent repellere, & Eccleſiæ intimare, atque eis injungendas ſententias ſatisfactorias pro peccatis efficaciter adimplere conſtante proceſſu; & hoc eſt verum, & ſub pœna relapſus in proceſſu contenta.

Item & quod pro pœnitentiis fuit eis ſpecialiter injunctum poſt abjurationem ſupradictam, quod viri qui fuerant in cavernis rupum ſe defendentes, ad quinquenium, alii vero qui non ibi fuerant, ad biennium deferrent cruces duas telæ crocei coloris in ſuperiori veſte ante & retro conſutas, & talia fuerunt eis injuncta Ebreduni ubi fuerunt ante fores majoris eccleſiæ; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod ſucceſſive dicti abjurati poſt eorum abjurationem Eccleſiæ mandatis & monitionibus, abjurationibus & monitionibus & promiſſionibus factis parere pertinaciter contempſerunt; & ideo nominatim citati fuerunt viſuri teſtes prædicti jurare & examinari contra eos per Procuratorem fidei producendos, quibus non comparentibus ac teſtibus in eorum contumacia examinatis, iterum citati fuerunt viſuri atteſtationes publicari, qui comparere renuerunt; ex quorum quidem teſtium tam Presbyterorum quam aliorum Catholicorum bonorum fide dignorum, & ſuorum complicum depoſitionibus luce meridiana clarioribus apparet eoſdem de Frayxineria fuiſſe & eſſe *ficte converſos* & relapſos, quia hæreticos banitos receptaverunt, & pœnitentias eis injunctas non impleverunt, vocati venire noluerunt, quinimo Barbas & Magiſtros Valdenſium poſtmodo receperunt, & eis more priſtino confeſſi ſunt; & hoc eſt verum.

Item & quod ſucceſſive authoritate Apoſtolica deputatus fuit Inquiſitor in dictis vallibus frater Franciſcus Plorerii Ordinis Minorum ſacræ Theologiæ profeſſor, qui de Anno Domini milleſimo quadringenteſimo octuageſimo nono, & die prima Januarii intelligens quod ipſi de Frayxineria de relapſu eſſent diffamati ſignanter informatus à Curato loci

& à pluribus de dicto loco Frayxineriæ ac cum veris Catholicis & etiam complicibus usque ad numerum sexaginta sex, quorum dictorum apparuit quod dicti de Frayxineria non impleverunt eis impositas pœnitentias, nec detulerunt cruces in suis superioribus vestibus: quinimo receptaverunt Hæreticos banitos, nec revelarunt ecclesiæ, contravenientes eorum abjurationibus, inter quos Angelinus Paloni qui nunc causam prosequitur descriptus invenitur, ex quo viso informabatur antefactus dominus Inquisitor cum Ordinario procedens, quia solus non poterat, per literas patentes eos omnes nominatim citari mandavit responsuros de fide & de relapsu, qui suspectissimi se excusaturos, executos de Anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono & die vigesima quarta Maii: qui tamen comparere postposuerunt, ex quo per alias literas legitime executas secundo citati fuerunt eodem anno & die vigesima octava Maii, sed comparere contempserunt, duobus exceptis qui nominibus propriis comparuerunt, & ideo non comparentes fuerunt. Et tertio per literas die septima Junii ejusdem anni debite executas vocati & non comparentes, in eorum contumacia excommunicati, & crescente contumacia aggravati, & quam excommunicationis sententiam in eos ut præmittitur latam, indurato animo sustinuerunt & adhuc sustinent, propter quod per alias vestras legitime executas anno prædicto & die vigesima octava Junii citati fuerunt audituri, & visuri se veluti pertinaces hæreticos relapsos brachio seculari relinqui, & eorum bona à die commissii quævis confiscata fuisse declarari; qui & iterum citati anno prædicto & die quinta Julii, ac iterum vocati anno quo supra & die sexta Septembris audituri sententiam contra eos ferendam, nunquam ut obstinati comparere curaverunt, ex quo rectè & ritè jure suadente damnati fuerunt, ex quo nunc audiendi non sunt, cum sint excommunicati, & interdicti, & pro talibus ac hæreticis pertinacibus declarati per sententias in rem judicatam transactas, nulla appellatione suspensas, adversus quas dicere aliquid admitti posse non videtur, nisi prius parito monitionibus, & judicatis, & ecclesiæ mandatis ac solutis expensis, super quibus dictus Procurator tanquam super articulo præjudiciabili petit jus dici & interloqui, justque & justitiam ministrari, officium vestrum humiliter implorando.

Processus

Processus Inquisitoris contra Barbam. Martinum, ex Cod. MS. H. in Biblioth. publica Cantabr.

ANNO Domini millesimo quadringentesimo nonagesimo secundo, die septima mensis Augusti apud Ulcium venerabilis Dominus Bartholomæus Paschalis Canonicus & Pidancerius ac Locumtenens venerandi Domini de Turrellis, vicarii generalis reverendissimi in Christo Patris & Domini Domini Joannis Michaelis miseratione divina Episcopi Prænestini, Cardinalis sancti angeli, administratoris & commendatoris inclyti monasterii Ulciensis, secum existentibus spectabilibus & egregiis Dominis Pontio Pontii Dalphinali consiliario & Oroncio Eme Judice Bernienſi processit ad examinationem Franciſci de Girundino, de Spoleto Barba Martino nuncupato, detento infra Carceres Dalphinales Ulcii.

Et primo dixit, quod sunt sexdecim anni elapsi quod Girondinus ejus pater ipsum loquentem ipsam fidem Valdensium & hæresim docuit. Et incœpit ipsum ducere per patrias.

Interrogatus per quas patrias & regiones eum eduxit? dixit quod per patrias & regiones Italiæ, videlicet Januæ, Bononiæ, Luce, & per montem Marchancone, & ipse ejus pater, qui erat Barba, ibat ad confitendum & prædicandum gentes in illis montibus.

Interrogatus cum quibus fuit, in quibus partibus, & quos perseveravit & conversatus est? dixit quod ex post secundo anno ivit ad discendum dictam doctrinam Valdensium cum viro alio Barba vocato Barnovo, qui erat de loco Perupage, & de dominio de Camerino, qui duxit ipsum spacio duorum vel trium annorum per loca supradicta.

Interrogatus cum quo ex post dictum Barnovo sequutus est dictam doctrinam, dixit quod cum quodam alio Barba nominato Josue, qui erat de loco sancto de dominio de Camerino, propè locum de Camerino, trium milliarium de Charretto. Dicens ulterius quod postquam ivit cum dicto

Joſue ad confitendum & prædicandum dictam ſectam, & per dicta loca quidam alius Barba nominatus Andreas, duxit ipſum ad eorum magnum Magiſtrum qui vocatur Joannes Antonii, & qui ſuam reſidentiam facit in loco de Cambro de dominio Papæ.

Interrogatus quid ſibi dixit dictus magnus Magiſter, dixit quod in primis injunxit ſibi quòd faceret ſacramentum ſub fide ipſorum & aliud inſuper ſibi injunxit. Super omnibus quod pro aliqua re mundi non revelaret, prorſus nec manifeſtaret quæ ſibi dicere volebat.

Dicens ſibi quod manifeſtare ſeu revelare eorum fidem erat peccatum inexpiabile & irremiſſibile. Dicens eidem, quod ſi vellet ſectam tenere & inſequi dictam ſectam, faceret ſibi multa bona.

Interrogatus ſi erant aliqui alii, dixit quod ſic, quos vocabat Barbas, & vocabatur ipſe magnus Magiſter eorum Barba, & dicebat quod omnes tenebant dictam fidem & quod tenerent ſecretè.

Et ulterius dicebat, Magnus Magiſter qui monebat eos, ut ſervarent eorum fidem & eſſent ſalvati, & ita prædicabat, Quod omnes qui ſequerentur eorum fidem erunt ſalvati; qui verò non ſequerentur eandem ſectam, non erunt ſalvati, ſed erunt damnati.

Interrogatus quod eſt potiſſimum fundamentum eorum fidei & ſectæ? dixit quod eorum Magiſter dixit, & ita reperiunt dicti Barbæ eundo per mundum, quod propter malam & peſſimam vitam Papæ, Cardinalium, Epiſcoporum, & Sacerdotum, Religioſorum, & omnium aliorum Eccleſiaſticorum virorum, ipſi Barbæ ſequuntur hanc fidem, & reperierint infinitos errores. Quia dicti Papa, Cardinales, Epiſcopi & Eccleſiaſtici viri, ducunt, & omnes ſequuntur avaritiam, luxuriam, ac ſuperbiam & pompas, peccatum gulæ & iræ; & in hoc omnes viri eccleſiaſtici errant; & eorum hoc eſt potiſſimum fundamentum, quia viri eccleſiaſtici male & peſſime vivunt.

Dicens ulterius, quod poſtquam ipſi viri Eccleſiaſtici ſunt in peccato mortali, non poſſunt miniſtrare ſacramenta, nec valent ea quæ ipſi faciunt, quia quando efficiuntur ſacerdotes, jurant caſtitatem, puritatem & virginitatem, &

quando

quando committunt peccata, frangunt fidem & juramentum, & veniunt contra fidem, & ex post perdunt omnimodam potestatem, quia quando candela lucens mortua est, non potest aliam vivificare.

Dicens ulterius, quod non est Papa nec Cardinalis, nec Episcopus, nec aliquis alius Ecclesiasticus vir, qui ut plurimum non habeat suam dominam & suum Regascum qui dormiunt cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, quod dictus ejus magnus magister eisdem injunxit quod prædicarent & ampliarent eam fidem, & traherent gentes quantum possint ad illam, quia hoc faciendo lucrarentur vitam æternam, cum omnes de eorum fide sunt salvati, cæteri vero damnati.

Dicens quod quando eorum magnus Magister . . . appellat communitatem, quando facit eos Barbas & dat potestatem, mutat eorum nomina, & quod ipse antequam esset Barba effectus per dictam eorum communitatem, appellabatur Franciscus, & quando fuit factus Barba, imposuit sibi nomen Martinus.

Dicens ulterius, quod constituuntur Barbæ, & vacat officium Barbarum, & quando moritur aliquis Barba, substituitur unus alius loco illius.

Interrogatus si habeant provincias, dixit quod non, sed vadunt per mundum circumcirca.

Interrogatus quid ulterius injungebat eorum Magister, & quid prædicare consueverunt Barbæ per orbem, dixit quod dicebat & ipsi prædicare consueverant quod unus solus Deus est adorandus, qui creavit cœlum & terram, lunam, solem, & stellas, & aquam, & quod credant solum & dumtaxat ea quæ vident.

Interrogatus quid dicebat eorum Magister eisdem Barbis, de Sanctis, & quid prædicant de Sanctis, dixit quod credunt in S. Petrum, & post ipsum in S. Gregorium, & Sylvestrum, & in S. Joannem Evangelistam; in S. Paulum vero non credunt quia fuit assassinus.

Interrogatus quare melius credunt in sanctum Petrum quam in S. Paulum, dixit quod ex eo, quia Deus constituit eundem S. Petrum vicarium suum, & dedit eidem potesta-

tem

tem absolvendi & ligandi, & quod ipse S. Petrus fecit ipso vivente miracula, & ideo credunt in ipsum inter cætera.

Interrogatus quæ miracula fecit? dixit quod quando S. *Petrus* constrúi faciebat Ecclesiam Sancti Petri in Roma, Diabolus venit ad ipsum, & dixit eidem, Ego faciam construere pulchriorem domum quam tu in breviori tempore, dicens, quod in crastinum, & modicum post Diabolus dixit S. Petro, Venias ad videndum domum quam feci dum . . . quod quando intrabis dictam domum quam feci, aliquo pacto non facias signum Crucis. Et eo tunc S. Petrus venit ad visitandum dictam Ecclesiam seu Domum, & cum fuit in conspectu dictæ domus, quæ nunc dicitur Sancta Maria de Rotunda, cum cautela fecit signum Crucis dicendo, Et apponendo manum ad barbam, & per istam sanctam barbam: deinde ponendo manum ad Stomachum, dicendo, Per istum sanctum fontem: deinde ad brachia dextra & sinistra dicendo, Per istas spatulas, ista est domus pulchra, quo signo Crucis ut supra facto, Diabolus voluit ipsam domum destruere; sed Sanctus Petrus impedivit ipsum & adjurationem ejus fecit. Et quia dictus S. Petrus erat in valvis Ecclesiæ, Diabolus non potuit exire per Januam, sed affigens pedes in terram, dimisit vestigia, & exivit per unum foramen quod fecit in summitate Ecclesiæ, & quod foramen adhuc est nunc, nec potuit ex post reparari, & propter dictum miraculum quod videtur oculariter credunt in S. Petrum; in aliis autem Sanctis non credunt, quia fuerunt peccatores, & non viderunt eorum miracula.

De Sancto autem Johanne Baptista dixit quia non petiit gratiam à Domino, expectatur quod in diem Judicii intercedet pro omnibus, & nescitur si est in terra vel in cœlo, & credit quod est in Paradiso terrestri.

Dicens ulterius, quod in Angelis, Archangelis, Cherubim & Seraphim credunt, quia fuerunt creati à Deo Patre in vita æterna.

De Virg. Maria autem dixit quod quia solus Deus est adorandus, non sunt certi quod Virgo Maria audiat preces nostras, quia fuit humana Creatura, & quod *Ave Maria* non est oratio sed annunciatio & salutatio, & ideo non injungunt in pœnitentiam eis qui sunt de eorum secta, quod dicant *Ave Maria*

Maria, & quod ſolus *Pater Noſter* eſt vera oratio, quia à Deo facta fuit oratio illa.

De Purgatorio dixit quod nullum eſt Purgatorium, ſed viri Eccleſiaſtici propter avaritiam ipſorum reperierunt ad extorquendas pecunias pro Miſſis & Orationibus dicendis quæ de nihilo profunt; quia poſtquam homo moritur, aut eſt ſalvatus, aut eſt damnatus.

De Aqua Benedicta dixit, quod prædicant, dicunt & credunt, quod omni anno de menſibus Maii & in die Aſcenſionis Domini, quod Deus benedicit cœlum, terram, aquam, herbas, flumina, fontes & omnes fructus, & quod illa benedictio eſt ſecurior quam illa quæ fit à Presbyteris, quia non valet niſi ſint puri & mundi ab omni peccato; & quia quamplurimum Sacerdotes ſunt peccatores, ut ſupra dixit, & per conſequens & hujuſmodi rationes non credunt in aliis Sacramentis miniſtratis per viros eccleſiaſticos.

Dicens ulterius, Quod tantum valet orare in ſtabulo, quantum in templo, quia Deus eſt ubique.

De Feſtivitatibus autem dixit, Quòd Feſta quæ ſunt Præcepta à Deo, prout eſt Dies Dominicus, Feſtum nativitatis Domini, Feſtum Paſchæ, Aſcenſionis, & Pentecoſtes, ſunt celebranda; alia autem feſta Virginis Mariæ & Sanctorum ſunt feſticula, & qui non vult, non tenetur illa celebrare, quia non ſunt Præcepta, nec Vigiliæ ipſarum feſtivitatum ſunt jejunandæ.

De Corpore Chriſti dicunt; Quod quia viri eccleſiaſtici ſunt ut ſupra mali & peſſimæ vitæ & peccatores, quod non poſſunt conſecrare Corpus Chriſti, & non valet conſecratio per ipſos facta; ideo ipſi Barbæ, & qui ſunt de eorum ſecta, non recipiunt Euchariſtiam, ſed loco Euchariſtiæ benedicunt Panem, & dicunt, Quod illa benedictio eſt majoris virtutis quam dicta conſecratio, ex eo quia tantum quantum quis habet bonitatis & puritatis, tantum habet & poteſtatis.

De Peccato Carnis autem dixit in primis, quod eundo per mundum & prædicando de nocte faciunt Congregationes & Synagogas, in quibus in primis prædicatio fit per ipſas Barbas, & facta prædicatione incipiunt feſta ſolatia & choreas ducere invicem diſcurrendo per locum ubi ſunt cum candela accenſa, atque quod ſe ad invicem teneant per manus, & celebratis

ipſis

ipſis feſtis & ſolatiis, alter ipſorum & neſcitur quis ſuffocat lumen, quo ſuffocato, quilibet operatur, exercet corpora ſuper peccato carnis, prout accidit caſualiter, nec ibidem habetur reſpectus ad Patrem. Matrem. Filiam, nec ad aliquod, dicens, Quod ſi in dicta Synagoga generetur filius, quod ille filius erit in futurum aptior ad exercendum officium Barbarum, prædicationum & confeſſionum, quam aliquis alius, quia genitus eſt in dicta Synagoga: celebrata dicta Synagoga, quilibet recedit.

Dicens ulterius, quod ipſa Synagoga fit ſemel in anno in qualibet patria, & quod Barba qui eſt de patria in qua fit ſynagoga intereſt in ipſa ſynagoga, quia habet ibidem parentes; ſi autem non eſt de patria, ſolum prædicat, & poſt dimittit fieri inter ipſos eorum ſynagogam, ex eo quia non poſſet ſe immiſcere cum parentibus ſuis, & aliter non ſe poneret in dicta ſynagoga. niſi haberet parentes.

Extra autem ſynagogam dicunt, tenent,& prædicant quod peccatum Luxuriæ non eſt peccatum, niſi de Matre ad Filium, & è converſo; & de compatre ad commatrem, & non ultra: rationem reddens, quia à Deo eſt facta prohibitio de Filia ad Matrem. Nam cum Deus aſcenderet ad Cœlum dixit vulgariter & formaliter ut ſequitur, Creſcite & multiplicate, & Saint. Joanne garda te & done ſariti ſaliiti una voulta non S. toriali pie.

Interrogatus quod declaret illa verba? dixit, Quod Deus aſcendendo Cœlos dixit prædicta verba, intelligendo quod homo non debet reverti ad vulvam Matris unde exivit, & dicendo reſpicite S. Joannem Baptiſtam, quia Sanctus Joannes Baptiſta baptiſavit Chriſtum; & ex prædictis per Legem Divinam prohibita eſt, conjunctio de Filio & de commatre, unius autem alia carnalis copula permiſſa eſt, quia non eſt prohibita à Deo, ſed ſolum ab Eccleſia; & ideo indifferenter cognoſcunt ſe adinvicem; & utuntur dicta carnali copula, nec contradicunt ſibi invicem, quia melius eſt nubere quam uri.

Dicens ulterius, quod inter ipſos eſt honor quando Barbæ agnoſcunt eorundem Valdenſium & de *ſecta Filias.*

Et

Et ulterius, Si aliquis de ſecta ipſorum requirat aliquam mulierem, non contradicunt, quia non eſt peccatum, nec reſpiciunt parentes niſi ut ſupra.

Dicens, Quod habent articulum inter ipſos qui ſunt de ſecta, quod unus ſubveniat alteri, ex quo mulieres non audent eiſdem negare vel contradicere.

Super jurejurando dixit, quod nullo pacto jurandum eſt, quod nullo modo jurant inter ipſos, nec pro vero, nec pro falſo, quia eſt peccatum mortale.

Dicens ulterius, Quod pro quovis delicto quantumcunque gravi, quis non tradendus eſt morti, niſi ſit homicida.

Dicens ulterius, Quod quando creantur Barbæ, per eorum comites & Magiſtrum, Magiſter convocat certos alios Barbas ſectæ ut ſupra dixit, quod addendo ad ea quæ ſupra depoſuit; dicunt & Juramentum præſtant ipſi Barbæ prout formaliter ſequitur, Tu talis Jura ſupra la fide tua de mantenere; multiplicare & accreſcere noſtra lege & de non la diſcoperire à perſona dal monde & que tu prometes de non jurare Dieu anul modo,& que garda la domenega,et que non farai altro coiſino cauſa que non uvelho que ſie fato a te, & que tu credie en Dieu, que a fat el ſol & la luna, cœlum & terram, cherubim & ſeraphim & aquel que tu vedes, & præſtito dicto juramento, magnus Magiſter dat eidem Barbæ, ſic fato, ad bibendum modicum vini, extunc mutat ſibi nomen, dicendo, deſi en la la te chamaras tal, & quod ipſe loquens prius vocabatur Franciſcus, & nunc vocatur Martinus inter ipſos, & quod illa ſolemnitas habetur loco baptiſmi.

Dicens ulterius, Quod quando ipſi Barbæ audiunt confeſſiones à Gentibus de eorum ſecta ſecretam, nec confiteantur Sacerdotibus, nec recipiant Euchariſtiam niſi ficte & ſimulate, injungunt eis quod dictam ſectam teneant.

Dicens ulterius, Quod poſtquam exercuit Officium Barbarum dictæ ſectæ per Italiam ſpatio ſex annorum vel circa, quod à duobus annis citra tranſivit per montes pergendo verſus provinciam Provinciæ & Regnum Franciæ, & prima vice cum quodam alio Barba vocato Antonio de Pilhocalia de Spoleto, & anno elapſo ipſi duo venerunt & tranſiverunt

per montem Cineſcium, & venerunt ad Regnum Franciæ, & fuerunt in Provinciis Borbonii & de Rodes, Foreſt Alvernii, de Marca uſque ad patriam de Bordelleis, & in dictis Provinciis prædicaverunt eorum ſectam & confeſſi fuerunt quod plures in dictis Provinciis de dicta eorum ſecta ad dictam ſectam traxeruntquantum potuerunt.

Dicens ulterius, Quod reperierunt ſe quidem alii Barbæ in loco de Lymogiis, unde Colla de Joanne Baptiſta, de Thomaſſo, Paulo de mala carne, Bartholomeo, de Mocarello, Baſtiano Luce, omnes de Patria Spolitana, qui docuerunt ipſum loquentem & ejus ſocium & alios de eorum Secta; & docuerunt eos loca ad quæ poſſent accedere, & ibidem prædicare, & quod extunc juverunt ad prædicandum ad dictas Patrias & Regiones, ut ſupra.

Interrogatus quomodo nominantur omnes tenentes eorum ſectam, dixit quod de ultra Montes in Regno Franciæ appellantur Pauperes de Lugduno, de citra vero Montes in Patria Italiæ appellantur Pauperes Mundi; iſto vero anno venit cum Andrea etiam ejus ſocius Barba, & venerunt per patriam Januæ; deinde per Niciam & ad Civitatem Aquenſem; deinde ad Patriam de Vivareſio, ubi repererunt aliquos de iſta Secta.

Ibidem in Montibus Albenacii & de Privacio, ex poſt verſus Alverniam apud Clarum montem, unde ad Montem de *Monte aureo*; in quo Monte ſunt plures de dicta Secta, & ibidem multi reperiuntur, & ibidem maxime augmentatur propter malam vitam quam tenent Eccleſiaſtici viri

Item ulterius dixit quod iſta Secta creſcit & pullulat in locis de Heretable de ſtabulo, in Crapona & Sineria in eadem Regione Alvergniæ, & etiam in Patria Foreſii in Montibus de Furniis in Foretio & de Sancto Saforino, deinde venit ad Patriam Belvoſii, in qua etiam viget dicta Secta; unde in locis ſeu montibus prope Villam Belli Joci & prope Villam Francam, & de loco Belli Joci venerunt Lugdunum; & cum fuerunt in Civitate Lugduni ubi die ultima Maii, proxime fluxi, hoſpitati fuerunt retro Sanctum Niceſium in dicto loco ſigni forpicum, & ſe repererunt ibidem ex deliberatione inter eos facta octo Barbæ, unde alii ſex cum ipſis duobus vocantur Paſcalis de Paſco,

Paſco, Jacobus de Laro, Petrus Matthei de Capriano, Hucho de Andrea, Paſturius de Jaco, & cum ſupradicto, Petrus de Jaco, qui præſentialiter detinetur cum dicto loquente, qui omnes octo ſunt de Patria Spolitana, & ibidem adinvicem congregati habuerunt conferentiam de geſtis & gerendis per ipſos, recitantes loca unde veniebant & quo ibant.

Interrogatus, Quis ipſorum ſex reddebat rationem de Patria Delphinatus? dixit quod Paſchalis & Paſtuchinus, & dicebant, Quod fuerant in Dalphinatu, & reperierunt multos in Patria Valentinienſium in Montibus, de Secta Valdenſium; & fuerunt etiam in Patria Ebredunenſi & Vapincenſi, ubi etiam reperiebant multos qui fuerant banniti ab eorum Patria, & ejecti ab eorum domibus, & propter maximas tribulationes quas habuerunt aliqui ex eis, dicebant quod volebant tenere bonam fidem, alii vero dicebant quod credebant habere remedium, & quod volebant habere & tenere eorum Sectam.

Dicens ulterius, Quod cum ipſe & alius Andreas Barba ejus Socius, de menſe Martii proxime fluxo tranſirent per Provinciam veniendo ab eorum domibus, In ipſa patria Provinciæ & prope Civitatem Aquenſem reperierunt tres qui dicebant quod erant de Dalphinatu, qui tres agnoverunt ipſos Barbas in habitibus eorum; videlicet in Mantellis, & habuerunt invicem verba de dicta eorum Secta; & ipſi tres homines dixerunt, Quod erant banniti, & expectabant habere gratiam & reſtitui in eorum Bonis & Patria, & continuare in eorum propoſito primo.

Item dixit Quod ipſe Paſchalis & Paſtuchinus qui fuerunt in Dalphinatu, dicebant, Quod quantum potuerunt conati fuerunt conſolari ipſos bannitos & expulſos à Dalphinatu, ſed cauſante dura & nimia perſecutione compatiebantur vecordes & remiſſi, alii autem erant malæ voluntatis redeundi, ſperantes habere gratiam.

Dicens ulterius, Quod prænominati duo Barbæ dicebant, Quod habebant magnos perſecutores, & ipſos in Patria Delphinatus, viz. Reverend. Dominum Archiepiſcopum Ebredunenſem, & Dominum Poncium Poncii Conſiliarium & Dominum Oroncium Eme Judicem gran. quem Dominum

Poncium comminabantur; quod si ipsum reperirent, facerent sibi ex fato suo.

Dicens ulterius, Quod ipsi octo Barbæ discesserunt omnes à Civitate Lugduni, & ipse loquens mutavit socium, quia loco dicti Andreæ Barbæ, cepit dictum Barbam Petrum præsentialiter detentum; alii vero Barbæ discesserunt, & retrocesserunt ad eorum Patriam ex deliberatione inter eos facta, ut dicebant.

Dictus autem Petrus Barba ejus novus Socius, & ipse loquens reversi sunt ad Dominam nostram de Podio, ut supra dixit, & ad alia loca Alvergniæ, Foresii, Belli Joci, tendendo ad Civitatem d'Autun in Burgundia, in qua duo, & in quadam Valle, in qua est quoddam proximum flumen, quod discurrit à flumine de Lera; in qua Valle sunt aliqui de dicta Secta, & ex post venerunt per Patriam Belli Joci, unde prope Villam dicti Belli Joci & Villæ Francæ, ubi etiam de eorum Secta consortes multi sunt & ibidem morantur, & exinde redierunt Lugdunum ad prædictum Hospitium, & ex post arripuerunt viam apud Breffam & ad Sanctum Glaudium, & in Sancto Glaudio, & in quibusdam Montibus citra & ultra; ubi sunt plures de eorum Secta. Quilibet prædicant & eos de confessione audiunt, & exinde recesserunt & iverunt Gebennas & Niciacum, & à Niciaco ad locum Aquæ Bellæ; de Aqua Bella ad Cameram, & ibidem prope Cameram aliquos paucos comperierunt de eorum Secta; deinde venerunt ad Montem de Valono, Neuachiam & Bardonenchiam; & de Bardonenchia ad locum Ulcii: & inde Juvencellori & Salicis Ulcii usque prope Collem Costæ Planæ, transeuntes apud Pratum Jalatum, in quo Monte fuerunt capti & reversi, ducti, ultra reducti ad villam Ulcii per Officiarios Dalphinales Ulcii, ut apparet in Processu super hoc facto.

Interrogatus, Si sciebat quod in valle Prati Jallati erant aliqui de eorum Secta? dixit, quod sic voce & fama referentibus, & quod si dicti de Prato Jalato voluissent confiteri eis, audivissent eos, & quod illa spe transiverant per dictum locum animo exercendi eorum Officium & ad consolandum dictos Valdenses ibidem commorantes.

Interro-

Interrogatus, Quando audivit aliquos de confeſſione quomodo conſueverunt ipſos abſolvere? dixit & reſpondet, Quod non faciunt more Sacerdotum, ſed dicunt eis quod teneant eorum Sectam firmam, & inſuper injungunt eiſdem quod dicent aliquibus vicibus *Pater noſter* pro pœnitentia, non autem *Ave Maria*, neque permittunt peregrinationes Italiæ, elemoſynas ex amore Dei.

Interrogatus, Si inter ipſos Barbas de iſta Secta fecerunt deliberationem de ſe reperiendo in aliquo loco? dixit, Quod duo alii videlicet Joannes de Criſtophoro & Liberatus de Coqueto ſe debebant reperire cum ipſis duobus, videlicet ipſo loquente & ejus ſocio, in loco de Tortona in Lombardia.

Interrogatus, Ubi habuit colloquium cum ipſis duobus proxime nominatis, Joanne Criſtophoro & Liberato de Coqueto? dixit, Quod ipſi una cum ipſo Petro ejus ſocio ibidem detentis.

Interrogatus, Quando audit aliquos de Confeſſione de ipſa Secta, de quibus peccatis ut plurimum confitentur? dixit, Quod quando cohabitat Filius cum Matre, & Pater cum Filia, & cum Commatre & Compatre, extra tamen Synagogam, & quod multi confitentur perſeverare in dictis peccatis, & cohabitare cum ipſis.

Dicens ulterius, Quod confitentur de ſeptem Peccatis Mortalibus, & non de aliis Peccatis.

Sumptum ex ore Peyronettæ.

ISta Peyronetta citata venit, & tamen medio juramento, omnia negavit, tamen jussa mitti in carcerem, & missa, omnia sponte confessa est, videlicet, quod à viginti quinque annis eos vidit & cognovit, eorum prædicationes audivit, de non jurando per Deum, de festis aliquibus non calendis, de non potestate sacerdotum, & sæpe de Purgatorio, & vanum orare pro mortuis, de aqua benedicta, de dando potius elemosynas pauperibus quam in ecclesia offerendo, de Sanctis quod non habeant potestatem nos juvandi, de romipetagiis, de jejunio, & unde ortum habuerit secta, & quomodo oblationes desinunt facere, quomodo vidit eos novem aut decem vicibus, & quatuor vicibus eisdem confessa est peccata sua, nec unquam confessa est Curato suo, eis credidit & fidem dedit, misericordiam petiit, & repetita fuit.

Processus Inquisitionis contra Peyronettam, ex Codice H. Waldensium in public. Biblioth. Cantabrig.

INquisitionalis Processus factus & formatus coram egregiis & circumspectis viris Dominis Antonio Fabri Decretorum Doctore, Canonico Ebredunensi, hæreticæque pravitatis in toto Dalphinatu & comitatibus Viennensis, Valentinensis, & Diensis, Generali Inquisitore, à sancta sede Apostolica specialiter & immediate deputato, & Christofforo de Salhiente etiam decretorum Doctore, Canonico, Vicario & Officiali Valentiæ.

Ad instantiam & prosecutionem honorandi viri Domini Valentini de Razeriis Jurium professoris Procuratorisque fiscalis Valentiæ, & in hac parte Promotoris in favorem sanctæ fidei catholicæ, ejusque officii Inquisitionis Deputati.

Contra & adversus Peyronettam relictam Petri Beraud, alias Fornerii, loci Belli Respectus, Valentinensis Diœcesis ætatis suæ quinquaginta annorum vel circa, de nefandissima hæresi

hæresi Valdensium, seu pauperum de Lugduno, quæ in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, inculpatam & diffamatam.

In nomine Sanctæ, & individuæ Trinitatis. Ex serie atque tenore hujusmodi veri publici inquisitionalis, omnibus & singulis & Christi fidelibus tam præsentibus quam inde futuris luculenter innotescat, & in perpetuam redigatur memoriam. Ex anno nativitatis Domini millesimo quatercentesimo nonagesimo quarto & die Mercurii quæ fuit & intitulata extitit vigesima nona mensis Januarii apud locum Belli Respectus & in domo probi viri Glaudii sua hospitis ipsius loci, & in camera nova ipsius domus, coramque egregio & circumspecto viro Domino Antonio Fabri decretorum doctore, canonico Ebredunensi, Inquisitore sanctæ fidei catholicæ, authoritate Apostolica deputato, cum assistentia mei Vincencii Gobaudi Notarii, & in hac parte conscribæ, de cujus quidem Domini Inquisitoris potestate constat, literis Apostolicis in forma brevi inferius loco & ordine insertis.

Comparuit ibidem prædicta Peyronetta relicta Petri Beraudi alias, Fornerii, Belli Respectus, Valencien sis Diœcesis, quæ de mandato & authoritate ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris præcedentibus debitis informationibus contra eam ad causam hæresis pauperum de Lugduno, sive Valdensium quæ in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, quæ inculpata & diffamata existit, sumptis atque receptis factisque monitionibus generalibus contra quoscunque dicta labe infectos in parochia dicti loci executis, personaliter citata extitit ad respondendum de fide catholica, necnon de his quibus est inculpata ad causam hæresis prædictæ, & ibidem per memoratum Dominum Inquisitorem, suo medio juramento ad Sancta Dei Evangelia præstito, & ad pœnam perjurii & criminis sibi impositi, habendi pro integraliter confessata ac excommunicationis & viginti quinque Ducatorum auri, de veritate dicenda super his quibus interrogabitur, examinata & interrogata: quæ quidem Peyronetta prædicta volens, ut dixit, mandatis & præceptis justitiæ obtemperare, atque parere, paratam se obtulit omnem quam super his quibus interrogabitur siverit veritatem dicere & deponere, & licet sit fœmina simplex & ignara ac ingenio grossa, tamen dixit

vixisse

vixiſſe toto tempore vitæ ſuæ ad inſtar & modum fidelium Chriſtianorum, & ſecundum Sanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ traditionem, adeo quod non prætendit unquam à vera fide catholica deviaſſe, nec aberraſſe, nec per ea quæque dicet deviare ſeu aberrare intendit, de quo fuit ſolemniter proteſtata.

Et prælibatus Dominus Inquiſitor non obſtantibus excuſationibus ſupra per dictam Peyronettam deductis & allegatis, ex ſui officii incumbentia etiam propter notoriam diffamationem dictæ Peyronettæ, prout latius ex tenore dictarum ſecretarum informationum colligitur, ideo ipſam duxit examinandam & interrogandam per modum infra ſcriptum.

Et primo fuit prænominata Peyronetta in hac parte delata per prælibatum Dominum Inquiſitorem interrogata & examinata qua de cauſa ſeu ad quid venit? dicta Peyronetta coram eodem Domino Inquiſitore dixit & reſpondit quod ex eo quia fuit citata & advocata perſonaliter coram eodem Domino Inquiſitore comparitura pro reſpondendo de fide catholica, aut ſe excuſando ſuper inquiſitione hæreſis ſectæ Valdenſium ſeu alias Chagmardorum nuncupatæ, contra eam ut aſſeritur formata.

Interrogata quid eſt dicta hæreſis ſive Secta Valdenſium, alias Chagmardorum? dixit & reſpondit neſcire, neque ſcire velle quid ſit.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore viderit ſeu cognoverit nonnullos dictæ Hæreſis ſive Sectæ Magiſtros ſeu Prædicatores qui diſcurrere ſolent per rura & loca campeſtria eundo de domo ad domum, faciendo prædicationes clandeſtinas? dixit & reſpondit quod non, nec ſcit quinam dicantur dicti Prædicatores.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore audiverit aliquas prædicationes ſive documenta ab aliquibus hominibus ſecrete prædicantibus, præſertim horis nocturnis? dixit & reſpondit quod non.

Interrogata ſi ſciat ſe eſſe de Secta quæ vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum diffamatam & inculpatam? dixit & reſpondit quod non, nec poſſe ſuper hoc caput credi, inculpari ſeu diffamari legitimo titulo aut ratione aliqua.

Inter-

Interrogata an unquam fuerit requiſita aut inſtigata per quoſpiam de tenendo ſectam ipſam, aut aliam quamcunque? dixit & reſpondit quod non.

Interrogata an ſciat aliquos de loco prædicto Belli Reſpectus fore & eſſe de ſecta prædicta Chagmardorum? dixit & reſpondit quod non.

Interrogata an ipſa Peyronetta ſit de ſecta prædicta Chagmardorum, aut alias unquam ipſam ſectam tenuerit, ſive in eadem inſtructa fuerit? dixit & reſpondit, quod non eſt, nec unquam fuit de ſecta ipſa, nec eſſe, nec fuiſſe vult.

Interrogata an velit ſtare depoſitionibus teſtium fide dignorum ubi dicant eam eſſe de dicta ſecta? dixit & reſpondit quod ita, dum tamen non ſint ſibi ſuſpecti aut inimici.

Interrogata an habeat aliquos inimicos de quibus dubitare poſſet aliquid contra eam dicere velle contra veritatem? reſpondit ſe neſcire.

Amplius non fuit interrogata nec examinata, ſed audita ipſius Peyronettæ reſponſione per prædictum Dominum Inquiſitorem, quia ſecundum mentem & tenorem informationum contra eandam ad cauſam hæreſis prædictæ ſumptarum, eidem Domino Inquiſitori viſum fuit ipſam Peyronettam nimis ſufficienter ſuper præmiſſis reſpondiſſe, veritatemque nullatenus dixiſſe: ideo volens latius cum ea inquirere, ordinavit ipſam duci apud careres Epiſcopales Valentiæ, & ibidem tutè cuſtodiri & detineri donec ſufficientius de his quibus ex tenore dictarum informationum reperitur culpabilis, reſponderit.

Demum vero anno quo ſupra & die Veneris quæ fuit & intitulata extitit ultima menſis Januarii, apud Valentiam, & Palatio Epiſcopali ejuſdem, videlicet in camera reſidentiæ prælibati Domini Inquiſitoris, ac coram eodem exiſtens & perſonaliter conſtituta prænominata Peyronetta mandato ejuſdem Domini Inquiſitoris, infra carceres Epiſcopales detenta, quæ ut dixit attendens & conſiderans exhortationes ſibi noviſſime factas de dicendo veritatem ſuper interrogatoriis tangentibus ſectam prædictam, promittendo ſibi gratiam & miſericordiam ſi id faceret, ideo meliori & ſalubriori uti volens conſilio, non obſtantibus perjuriis, & aliis variationibus

tionibus per eam ſuperius in reſpondendo commiſſis, confidendo ad plenum de benignitate ipſius Domini Inquiſitoris, paratam ſe obtulit omnem veritatem quam ſuper meritis ipſius ſectæ ſciverit, dicere & ſponte confiteri, ac ſuam exonerare conſcientiam, rogando ſibi indulgeri & parceri ratione perjurii & de vacillationibus prædictis, & inde ſuam depoſitionem ſive confeſſionem benigniter admitti, erroreſque ſuos, ſi quos habeat, caritative & gratioſe corrigi, ſubmittendo ſe miſericordiæ & ordinationi Sanctæ Matris Eccleſiæ.

Et prælibatus Dominus Inquiſitor, recepto ab ipſa Peyronetta corporali juramento de veritate dicenda præſtito, impoſitaque ſibi pœna perjurii & rigoroſæ ſibi ferendæ juſtitiæ, caſu quo quidquam de ipſa veritate malicioſe occultaverit, ad ipſius examen proceſſit, in hunc qui ſequitur modum infraſcriptum.

In primis enim dixit & ſponte confeſſa eſt, quod dudum ſunt viginti quinque anni elapſi, vel circa, quibus venerunt ad domum quondam Petri Fornerii ſui mariti duo homines extranei, induti veſtibus griſei coloris, qui, ut ſibi viſum fuit, loquebantur lingua Italica, ſive Lumbardica, quos prædictus ejus maritus receperat in dicta ſua domo, amore Dei: tandem ipſis ibidem exiſtentibus hora nocturnâ poſt cœnam unus ipſorum legere cœpit unum parvum librum quem ſecum deferebat, dicendo in eodem deſcripta fuiſſe Evangelia, & præcepta legis, quæ ibidem dicebat ſe explicare & declarare velle in præſentia omnium ibidem circumſtantium, quia dicebat ſe fore miſſum ex parte Dei ad reformanda n fidem Catholicam, eundo per mundum ad inſtar Apoſtolorum pro prædicando bonis & ſimplicibus gentibus de modo & forma ſerviendi Deo, & vivendi ſecundum ejus mandata.

Et inter cætera dicebant quod nemo alteri facere debet id quod ſibi fieri nollet.

Item quod ſolus Deus erat colendus & adorandus, & deprecandus, quia ipſe ſolus eſt qui nos poteſt juvare.

Item quod jurare pro quavis occaſione vel cauſa Deum, pro vero vel mendacio, aut aliud quodcunque facere juramentum ubi poneretur iſta locutio *per*, erat magnum peccatum.

Item

Item quod Sacramentum Matrimonii debebat fideliter & firmiter cuſtodiri.

Item quod bona opera quæ fiunt ante mortem hominis, plus proſunt, quam omnia quæ fiunt poſt mortem.

Item quod Sancti & Sanctæ non erant deprecandi in noſtrum auxilium, quia non poterant nos in aliquo juvare niſi ſolus Deus.

Item quod dies Dominicales ſuper omnia alia Feſta debebant ſolenniter coli, alia vero Feſta dicebant fuiſſe per Eccleſiam inventa, quæ non erant de neceſſitate colenda, imo poterat aliquis operari in ipſis, exceptis feſtivitatibus Apoſtolorum & aliis majoribus quas non exprimebant.

Item quod viri Eccleſiaſtici nimias habebant & poſſidebant divitias atque bona ultra quam oportebat, ob quod multa mala faciebant, quorum aliqui, cauſantibus eorum ſuperfluitatibus & bonorum abundantiis, erant fœneratores, uſurarii, ſuperbi, & avaritia pleni; alii vero nimis lubriciter & inhoneſte vivebant, tenendo meretrices in domibus ſuis palam & publice, ſic malum exemplum oſtendendo in populo.

Item quod prædicti Sacerdotes, eorum cauſante mala vita, non habebant majorem poteſtatem abſolvendi, quam habebant ipſi prædicatores, ſive hujus Sectæ Magiſtri, imo ipſi Magiſtri ſive prædicatores, licet eſſent Laici, habebant tantam poteſtatem quantam ipſi Sacerdotes.

Item quod ſummus Pontifex ex quo non obſervabat ſanctitatem quam debebat obſervare, non habebat aliquam poteſtatem, dicendo de eodem in hæc verba, *Autant crois & autant malvais eſt le Pape comme nengun autre, & per ſe non ſages de puiſſance.*

Item quod in alio mundo nullum erat Purgatorium, dicendo quod quando quis moritur, ejus anima tendit ad Paradiſum illico & incontinenter, dummodo bene & juſte vixerit; ſi vero male, ad infernum.

Item & ſubſequenter quod fruſtra fiebant deprecationes, cantaria & alia ſuffragia pro animabus defunctorum; nihilque valebat id quod faciebant Sacerdotes eundo per cœmiterium, aſpergendo aquam Benedictam ſupra ſepulturas mortuorum, dicendo, Kirie Eleyſon, Chriſte Eleyſon, &c.

Item quod Deus in initio mundi omnes aquas benedixerat, & omnia alia quæ fecerat, propter quod non erat neceſſe iterato aquam benedicere per ſacerdotes, quæ etiam nihil plus valebat quam alia aqua.

Item quod prænominati ſacerdotes ex ſemetipſis invenerant ſeu reperierant, quod in alio mundo erat purgatorium, ad effectus ut faciendo cantaria & deprecationes pro defunctis, majora ſibi acquirant bona ex quibus eorum malam vitam ſuſtinerent.

Item quod melius & magis meritorium erat dare elemoſynam alicui pauperi infirmo aut leproſo, quam offerre in Eccleſia ſacerdotibus prædictis, qui erant nimis abundantes bonis.

Item quod ita bonum & utile erat orare Deum in domo aut alibi, ſicut in Eccleſia, quia Deus ubiq; eſt.

Item quod Sancti nec Sanctæ, quamvis propter eorum bene merita eſſent in Paradiſo collocati, non habebant poteſtatem nos in aliquo juvandi, & ideo non debebant deprecari in noſtrum auxilium.

Item quod in vanum erat recurrere ad Imagines Sanctorum & Sanctarum, orando coram ipſis, quia nullam habebant virtutem, cum non eſſent niſi res materiales & picturæ factæ in parietibus.

Item propterea nihil prodeſſe poterat facere Peregrinationes & Romipetagia ad orandum coram imaginibus ſanctorum & ſanctarum, cum nihil poſſint in noſtrum auxilium, ut prædictum eſt.

Item quod non erat neceſſe jejunare aliquas alias vigilias, quam feſtivitatum Paſchæ, Pentecoſtes, Nativitatis & aliarum magnarum feſtivitatum Dominicalium, & potiſſime diebus Veneris erat etiam jejunandum.

Item quod ipſi prædicatores ſive magiſtri hujuſmodi ſectæ, & ſacerdotes ſeu viri eccleſiaſtici olim ſolebant eſſe unius & ejuſdem legis & ordinis, ſed cum ipſi viri eccleſiaſtici voluerunt inſequi avaritiam & vanitates hujus mundi, & ipſi prædicatores in ipſa paupertate manere voluerunt; ideo fuit facta inter eos diviſio, & effecti fuerant inimici, adeoq; cum numerus ipſorum prædicatorum & aliorum hominum juſtorum hujuſmodi ſectam tenuerint, adhuc eſſet parvus atque rarus,

rarus, ideo eis erat neceſſe incedere occultè, ſicut faciebant Chriſtus & ejus Apoſtoli; quia niſi ipſi prædicatores ambularent caute & ſecrete, dubitabant ab aliis offendi & male tractari.

Interrogata de nominibus ipſorum hominum ſive prædicatorum talia prædicantium? dixit & reſpondit neſciviſſe eorum nomina.

Interrogata an propter ea quæ dicebant, non eſſe orandum pro defunctis, diſtulerit & obmiſerit portare oblationes ſeu offerre in Eccleſia pro ipſis defunctis? dixit & reſpondit quod multoties fecit oblationes in Eccleſia, quas non feciſſet niſi dubitaſſet quod aliqui male præſumpſiſſent de ea, & quod ſibi improperaretur quod eſſet Chagnarda.

Interrogata quis dedit ſibi notitiam dictorum prædicatorum ſive magiſtrorum, ſeu alias quomodo introducta fuit ad converſandum cum eis? dixit & depoſuit verum eſſe quod olim ipſa loquente exiſtente cum Telmono Paſchalis, quodam dicti loci Belli Reſpectus, quadam die de qua non recolit, & ipſis adinvicem de multis rebus conferentibus, deſcenderunt in propoſitum de modo vivendi ſecundum mandata Dei, & inter cætera alia verba inter eos tunc habita, prænominatus Telmonus Paſchalis dixit ſibi loquenti hæc verba vel eis ſimilia, videlicet, *Avés nous james auvi parler dung plen pung de mond, que ſi non era, tout le monde faria a fin*: Quæ quidem loquens ſibi reſpondit quod ita, videlicet cuidam Domino Andreæ . . . . . de loco Pigeſoni, Capellano, olim vicario ipſius loco Belli Reſpectus, qui quadam die Ramis palmarum, prædicando in ipſo loco Belli Reſpectus dicebat ſimilia verba, videlicet, *Ces ung plen pung de gent que ſoſten tot le mond, & ſi aquello gent non era, tot le monde faria a fin*; quo tunc prænominatus Telmonus Paſchalis replicavit in hæc verba, *& daquelles gens vos parle yen*; dicendo ſibi quod ſi contingeret ipſas gentes venire ad ejus domum, quod audacter loqueretur cum eis, & eorum documenta auſcultaret, cum exinde melius ſe haberet; tamen dixit quod dictus Telmonus dubitabat ipſam, ne alicui præmiſſa panderet ſeu detegeret, ut moris eſt mulierum ſuperflue loqui, ideo ſibi fecit fieri juramentum ſuper literis de non dicendo aut manifeſtando alicui quidquam de præmiſſis, prout &

ipſa

ipſa loquens fecit, & ex poſt ipſa loquens fuit inclinata & affecta videre dictas gentes prout fecit ut ſupra. ——

Interrogata ſi viderit dictos Magiſtros ſive Prædicatores, de quibus ſuperius, ultra vicem prædictam? dixit & reſpondit quod à ſupradicto tempore viginti quinq; annorum citra, vidit diverſis vicibus, de quarum numero dixit ſe non poſſe bene recordari; tamen exiſtimatione ſua credit eos vidiſſe in univerſo novem aut decem vicibus, incluſa prima vice ſuperius declarata.

Interrogata an qualibet vice qua eos vidit, audiverit ſimilia documenta, modo & forma quibus ſuperius declaravit? dixit & reſpondit quod ita.

Item, De dictis novem vel decem vicibus quibus dictos Magiſtros prædicantes vidit & audivit? dixit dicta loquens quod fuit aliquoties in domo prænominati Telmoni Paſchalis & Guillielmi Paſchalis, ubi ipſi Prædicatores fuerunt & fecerunt eorum prædicationes modo præmiſſo, præſentibus omnibus illis de eadem domo, videlicet dicto Telmono & Guillielmo Paſchalis; de nominibus autem aliorum præſentium dixit ſe non recordari.

Item, Similiter dixit eos vidiſſe in domo Petri Garnerii ejuſdem loci certis vicibus, de quibus nec de tempore non poteſt recordari, ubi etiam fuerint factæ prædicationes prædictæ, præſentibus eodem Petro Garnerii & aliis de eadem domo, quorum nomina ignorat.

Interrogata ſi aliqui alii circumvicini interfuerint in prædictis prædicationibus factis in domibus eorum Paſchalorum, & Petri Garnerii? dixit quod non, quantum ſibi poteſt recordari.

Interrogata an ſciat quantis vicibus dicti Prædicatores fuerunt in domo ſua ſive ſui quondam Mariti? dixit & reſpondit juxta æſtimationem ſuam, quod fuerunt in dicta ejus domo quatuor aut quinque vicibus, & ibidem prædicationes aſſuetas fecerunt.

Interrogata qui ſunt illi qui erant præſentes & audientes in dictis prædicationibus factis in domo prædicta? dixit & reſpondit quod Petrus Beraudi alias Fornerii ejuſdem loquentisq; maritus dum vivebat; necnon aliquoties ibidem veniebant

Joannes

Joannes Prodome, & aliquando Telmonus Paſchalis quidam, & Guillielmus Paſchalis ac Petrus Garnerii, ſeu eorum alter alternatis vicibus,& aliquoties duo vel tres eorundem ſimul.

Interrogata ſi unquam confeſſa fuerit peccata ſua alicui ex dictis prædicatoribus ſive magiſtris? dixit & reſpondit quod ſingulis vicibus quibus ipſi prædicatores fuerunt in domo ſui quondam mariti, ipſa confeſſa eſt peccata ſua alteri ex eis genibus flexis, ac ſi fuiſſet coram ſuo proprio ſacerdote, & inde facta confeſſione,ipſam abſolvebat,manum ad caput imponendo more ſacerdotum.

Interrogata quam pœnitentiam ſibi imponebant prædicti prædicatores ſive Magiſtri pro peccatis confeſſatis? dixit & reſpondit quod diceret frequenter *Pater noſter*, & hoc tantum quantum poſſem, & quod jejunaret aliquibus diebus Veneris, & faceret aliquas elemoſynas ſecundum ſuam facultatem.

Interrogata quot vicibus confeſſa eſt dictis prædicatoribus? dixit quod tantis vicibus quantis fuerunt in dicta eorum domo, videlicet quatuor aut quinque vicibus, prout ſupradictum eſt.

Interrogata an confeſſa fuerit Capellano ſuo vidiſſe & cognoviſſe prædictos Magiſtros ſive prædicatores, eorumq; prædicationes audiviſſe? dixit & reſpondit quod non, quia non credebat male agere.

Interrogata ſi crediderit ſeu alias dederit fidem ſupradictis prædicatoribus ſive Magiſtris & eorum documentis & doctrinæ? dixit & ſponte confeſſa eſt quod tanquam mulier inſipiens & innocens & facilis ad decipiendum, credidit & dedit fidem eiſdem prædicatoribus & eorum doctrinis ſive documentis, credendo bene & ſalubriter agere, nec putabat propterea errare in aliquo. Veruntamen ubi videatur aut cognoſcatur ipſam in aliquo aberraſſe, ſe ſubmiſit benignæ correctioni ſanctæ Matris Eccleſiæ & eorundem dominorum Inquiſitoris ſive Officialis, petendo de omnibus in quibus potuit hactenus in præmiſſis errare, veniam & miſericordiam ſibi impertiri.

Memoratus enim Dominus Inquiſitor, audita confeſſione prædictæ Peironettæ, volens ſuper eadem deliberare,nec non cum eadem latius inquirere ſuper præmiſſis, terminum ſta-

tuit

tuit & assignavit eidem Peironettæ ad latius deponendum & declarandum super præmissis & aliis audiendis, deliberatione ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris hinc ad diem crastinam circa horam meridiei: & iterum ordinavit eam stare sub prædicta carcerum custodia.

Crastina autem die supra noviſſime per prælibatum Dominum Inquisitorem pro termino in causa hujusmodi assignata, quæ fuit intitulata Sabbati, prima mensis Februarii in Camera superius mentionata & coram præmemorato Domino Inquisitore venit & comparuit supranominata Peironetta ibidem per carcerarium Episcopalem de mandato præfati Domini Inquisitoris ad actum hujusmodi à carceribus ipsis educta, petens & humiliter requirens se à dictis carceribus relaxari, paratam se offerendo facere quæ debebit, nec non latius respondere super omnibus quibus interrogabitur: Et Dominus Inquisitor præfatus visa ipsius loquentis superius facta confessione, ad majorem veritatis corroborantiam duxit eandem super eadem & omnibus in ea contentis examinandam & repetendam, vigore juramenti per eam supra præstiti ac sub pœna qua supra. Quæ quidem Peironetta delata audito tenore jam dictæ suæ confessionis sibi per me Notarium infra scriptum de verbo ad verbum in vulgari sermone recitatis & declaratis ac per eam ut dixit, integraliter intellectis dixit, deposuit & sponte confessa est ea omnia & singula in jam dicta ipsius depositione & confessione, singula singulis, contenta & descripta fore & esse vera & veritati consona eisq; tanquam recte & legitime dictis & confessatis persistit, pro quibus omnibus & singulis se submisit misericordiæ sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ & jam dictorum dominorum Inquisitoris & Officialis, petendo & requirendo se à carceribus quibus pro præmissis detinetur relaxari: Et præterea addendo prædictæ suæ confessioni dixit audivisse à suprafatis prædicatoribus sive Magistris prædicantibus, quod sacerdotes recipientes pecunias pro missis celebrandis comparabantur Judæ qui vendidit Christum propter pecuniam: & illi qui dabant ipsas pecunias dictis sacerdotibus occasione ipsarum Missarum, comparabantur Judæis qui Christum emerunt pecuniis.

Item

Item, Addendo dixit & confessa est, quod prædicti Prædicatores dum recedebant à domo sua aliquoties dabant sibi certam quantitatem acuum sive d' Aiguilles, & ejus quondam maritus dum vivebat dabat eis pecunias pro pœna ipsorum.

Interrogata quantum dabat eis dictus ejus quondam maritus pro dicta eorum pœna, dixit nescire, quia non vidit numerari.

Interrogata qui sunt illi de dicta ejus domo qui dictos homines sive prædicatores viderunt, & audiverunt eorum prædicationes, dixit quod Fancisca ejusdem loquentis filia & Simeon Acto maritus ipsius Franciscæ?

Interrogata si fuerit unquam in loco de Bareillonia ubi dictos Magistros prædicatores audiverit prædicantes? dixit & respondit verum esse, & sibi recordari quod olim sunt decem anni elapsi vel circa quibus Petrus Fornerii ejus quond. vir ac ipsa loquens accesserunt apud dictum locum Bareilloniæ ad visitandum Fabrentes ipsius loci, quia erant & adhuc sunt affines ejus, & visitando steterunt ibidem uno vel duobus diebus, quo interim ipsa loquens & prædictus ejus maritus quondam, quodam vespere iverunt de domo Joannis Fabri ubi erant hospitati, ad domum Moneti Fabri, fratris ipsius Joannis pro eundem Monetum visitando, tandem dum intrassent domum ipsius Moneti reperierunt ibidem duos ex prædicatoribus sive Magistris prædictis, qui ibidem præsente dicto Moneto & ejus familia prædicabant: & videns dictus Monetus ipsam loquentem & ejus virum ibidem ex incogitato intrasse & adveniss, fuit valde tristatus atque iratus de adventu ipsorum conjugum ad causam dictorum prædicatorum ibidem secreto prædicantium, & videntes ipsa loquens & dictus ejus quondam vir, eundem Monetum esse ita iratum & male contentum propter adventum ipsorum, post modicum temporis ab ipsa domo recesserunt.

Interrogata quid sibi dixerunt supradicti duo prædicatores? dixit quod nihil.

Interrogata ſi propter adventum ſuum & ſui viri, dicti prædicatores deſierint prædicare? dixit quod non.

Interrogata an ipſa & ejus vir ex tunc cognoverunt dictos prædicatores eſſe de conſortio & converſatione ipſorum? dixit & reſpondit quod in verbis ſuis cognovit eos eſſe de illis.

Interrogata ſi unquam alias viderat dictos duos homines ſive prædicatores in domo ſua de Bello Reſpectu? dixit non poſſe recordari.

Interrogata quid dicebant dicti prædicatores in eorum prædicationibus? dixit non poſſe bene recordari, quia paucum ſteterant ibidem propter turbationem prædicti moneti.

Interrogata an dicti prædicatores eo tunc iverint ad domum ſupradicti Joannis Fabri? dixit quod non.

Amplius non fuit eo tunc interrogata, tamen prælibatus Dominus Inquiſitor certis motus reſpectibus etiam ut dictæ mulieri parcatur laboribus & expenſis, recepto prius ab eadem juramento per eam ad ſancta Dei Evangelia præſtito, de ſe repræſentando toties quoties vocabitur, impoſitaque ſibi pœna hæreticis relapſis à jure indicta, caſu quo comparere obmiſerit, tandem à carceribus prædictis quibus ob cauſam hujuſmodi detinebatur, dixit & juſſit relaxandam uſq; ad primam deliberationem ſive novum mandatum.

Rurſum vero anno quo ſuperius & die dominica ramis palmarum, computata vigeſima tertia menſis Martii, apud locum prædictum Belli Reſpectus, & coram nobis Henrico Dileri Capellano, & Vincentio Gobaudi Notariis publicis & cauſæ hujuſmodi ſcribis, ac in hac parte commiſſis per egregium & circumſpectum virum Dominum Chriſtophorum de Salhiente decretorum doctorem vicariumq; & officialem Valentiæ, vivæ vocis oraculo expreſſe deputatis, & ibidem infra domum clauſtralem ipſius loci, vocata, ſupradicta Peironetta, & ea in præſentia noſtra perſonaliter conſtituta, ipſam juxta nobis commiſſa de & ſuper omnibus & ſingulis per eam pridem ſuperius dictis, & confeſſatis, eis omnibus prius lectis & in lingua vulgarica & laica de verbo ad verbum recitatis & declaratis; duximus repetendam & re-examinandam, quibus omnibus & ſingulis

per

per eam ut dixit ad plenum perceptis, ejus medio juramento ad ſancta Dei Evangelia præſtito, impoſitaq; ſibi pœna qua ſuperius, videlicet quæ de jure hæreticis relapſis debetur de dicenda veritate, dicta Peironetta dixit & ſponte confeſſa eſt ea omnia & ſingula ſupra per eam dicta, depoſita & confeſſata, fore & eſſe vera, veritati conſona, prout & quemadmodum ſcripta ſunt ſuperius, eiſque omnibus & ſingulis tanquam recte & legitime confeſſatis atque depoſitis, perſiſtit petendo continue veniam & miſericordiam. Actum uti ſupra præſente venerabili viro Domino Guillielmo Blanchardi Vicario dicti loci. Quibus ſic geſtis dicta Peironetta virtute juramenti per eam ſuperius ſæpiſſime præſtiti, ac ſub pœnis quibus ſupra præmiſſis ſe repræſentare coram prælibato Domino Inquiſitore ac Domino Officiali toties quoties vocabitur ex parte eorum.

Proceſſum, ſive Acta præcedentia ſumpſi & recepi ego Notarius ſubſignatus,

GOBAUDI.

FINIS.